

LEVEL
ONE

THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

November, 1921

Vol. 10 No. 3

Editorial Comment	- - -	179
The Ambition for Sanctity—On Letting People Alone—Knowledge of Ceremonial—The Presbyterians and the Lambeth Appeal—The Situation in Palestine—The Reorganized Churchman's Alliance.		
Catholic Character	- - - - -	188
<i>The Bishop of Albany.</i>		
Recent Utterances on Church Unity	- - -	194
<i>Lucius Waterman.</i>		
The Fallacies of Dr. Frank Crane	- - -	223
<i>George Craig Stewart.</i>		
The Practical Significance of the Devotional Life	-	234
<i>Laird Wingate Snell.</i>		
William White	- - - - -	247
<i>Julia C. Emery.</i>		
On Finding a Substitute for Christ	- - -	265
<i>Henry K. Pierce.</i>		
Book Reviews	- - - - -	272

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under act of March 3, 1879.

Issued by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 1 and 3 Peace Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.



How to Interest Your Class

Anyone can arouse and hold the attention of a group of people if he can tell them a great deal about an interesting subject. The Bible is full of interest and you can interest and help your class by learning a great deal about it. The teacher whose mind is full of the lesson has no trouble with inattention in the class. These books will help you.

Oxford Helps to the Study of the Bible

Summaries of the several Books, with copious explanatory notes and tables illustrative of Scripture History and the characteristics of Bible Lands, embodying the results of the most recent researches, together with a dictionary of Scripture Proper Names, a Biblical index, concordance, 124 full-page plates selected and arranged by Sir F. Maunde Thompson, and a new series of maps.

No. 10—Pearl, 16mo. (4x5½ in.), cloth, red edges \$1.35

No. 15—Long Primer Cr. 8vo. (4¾x7¾ in.), cloth, red edges 4.25

The Complete Bible in Modern English

Translated Direct from the Hebrew, Chaldee and Greek, with Explanatory Notes by Ferrar Fenton, M.R.A.S., M.C.A.A., etc.

The complete Bible, translated directly from the original languages into the language of to-day. Poetry printed in metrical form, and paragraph divisions as in modern usage. Of great value to all Bible students whether beginners or advanced.

Complete in one volume. Cloth binding \$5.50

Also bound in Persian Seal, limp, round corners, red under gold edges 10.50

The Old Testament, in four volumes. Cloth binding, per volume 1.50

The New Testament, in one volume. Cloth binding 1.50

Oxford Pocket Concordance

Containing a Dictionary of Scripture Proper Names, Subject Index, Concordance and Maps.

No. 055—Pearl, 16mo. (5¾x4 in.), French Morocco divinity circuit, round corners, red under gold edges \$1.65

No. 065—Minion, 16mo. (6¾x4¼ in.), as 055 \$1.95

Scofield Reference Bible

With a New System of Connected Topical References to all the Greater Themes of Scripture, with Annotations, Revised Marginal Renderings, Summaries, Definitions, and index, to which are added Explanations of Seeming Discrepancies, and a New System of Paragraphs, a Panoramic View of the Bible and Bible Chronology, with Twelve Colored Maps.

Helps at the hard places where needed

No. 53—French Morocco binding, divinity circuit, round corners, red under gold edges \$6.00

Thirty-three other styles. Circular upon request.

Oxford S. S. Teachers' Bible

Containing the Cyclopedic Concordance being a Practical Bible Dictionary, including Concordance, Subject Index, Glossary, Chronologies, Harmony, Botany, etc., Under One Alphabet, with the latest Photographs from the Holy Lands.

No. 04453—Minion Black-faced type, French Morocco binding, divinity circuit, round corners, red under gold edges \$5.00

Many other styles. Send for particulars.

Oxford Cyclopedic Concordance

The Oxford Teachers' helps bound separately.

No. 1—Minion, 16 mo. (5x7½ inches), cloth, 324 pages, 31 illustrations \$.35

No. 2—Minion 8vo. (5½x8½ inches), cloth, 300 pages, 31 illustrations 1.35

No. 3—As No. 2, in French Morocco 2.35

A Guide to Bible Study

By Harry E. Richards, A.M., M.D.

A consecutive course of lessons on the whole Bible.

Junior Course, 120 Lessons

Crown fvo (8¼x5½ in.), cloth, 288 pages \$1.75

The Three Parts, separately, paper, each .50

Advanced Course, 160 Lessons

Crown 8vo. (8¼x5½ in.), cloth, 354 pages \$2.00

The Four Parts, separately, paper, each .50

Circular upon request



OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS AMERICAN BRANCH
35 WEST THIRTYSECOND STREET
NEW YORK



Please mention THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY when answering Advertisements

ALMANACS CONSOLIDATED

We have pleasure in announcing to the Church the
consolidation of the

CHURCHMEN'S YEAR BOOK and AMERICAN CHURCH ALMANAC
with the

LIVING CHURCH ANNUAL

In the future these will be issued as a single publication

The AMERICAN CHURCH ALMANAC is the most venerable publication in the Church, the number for 1921 being issued as Volume 91. The first issue was for the year 1830, and its publication has been continuous since that year.

The LIVING CHURCH ANNUAL was founded in 1882 by the Rev. C. W. Leffingwell, D.D., then editor of The Living Church, and has been continuously under the present management since 1885. In 1909 WHITTAKER'S CHURCHMEN'S ALMANAC was consolidated with the publication, since which they have been issued as a single work. Thus The LIVING CHURCH ANNUAL now includes the three historic Year Books of the Church, and, being the only surviving publication of the kind, will naturally be desired by all intelligent Churchmen. The publication for 1922 is now well under way.

PRICES (subject to change by reason of the chaos resulting from the present printers' strike, which may increase the costs so largely that a slight increase in price will be necessary). Paper, 85c. Cloth \$1.15. Postage east of Colorado, about 15c.

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING COMPANY

1801-1811 Fond du Lac Ave., Milwaukee, Wis.

A TIMELY CHRISTMAS GIFT

A Spiritual Bouquet

In Honour of

THE MOST BLESSED SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR

Being a very careful selection of the finest flowers of Humility, Faith and Devotion, gathered in from many and various sources and brought together for the express purpose of providing the faithful laymen and laywomen of the Church with a worthy means of approaching The Sacramental Majesty of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST.

By REV. C. BERTRAM RUNNALLS, Rector of Saint Paul's Church, Marion, Ohio.

PRICE, FORTY CENTS, POSTPAID
Mail Orders to

**AMERICAN PRINTING AND
SUPPLY CO.**

169 East Court St., Marion, Ohio

Fourth Thousand in Press

The Server's Manual

By the REV. ROBERT LAU, D.D.

18mo, boards\$0.35

A manual to show the men and boys of the American Church how to serve at the Holy Mysteries in a simple and reverent manner.

Thirty-third Thousand

A Manual for Altar Guilds

With suggestions for Altar Linen

By JOSEPHINE WOOD

40 pages, illuminated cover.....\$0.15

Preparation of the Vessels for the Holy Communion

A card 11x14 inches, giving six illustrations and suggestions for the proper preparation of the vessels for the Holy Communion, arranged by Mrs. H. L. Burleson.

The price is 30 cents. On cardboard.

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Publisher

11 West 45th St., New York

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

The Rt. Rev. Richard Henry Nelson, D.D., is the Bishop of Albany.

The Rev. Lucius Waterman, D.D., has retired from the active exercise of his priesthood and is living at Tilton, New Hampshire.

The Rev. George Craig Stewart, D.D., L.H.D., is Rector of St. Luke's Church, Evanston, Ill.

The Rev. Laird Wingate Snell is Rector of St. Peter's Church, Helena, Montana.

Miss Julia C. Emery is well known throughout the Church for her work in connection with the Woman's Auxiliary.

The Rev. Henry K. Pierce is on the staff of the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York.

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

1-3 Peace St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: HON. WILLIAM J. TULLY, Corning, N. Y.

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Three Dollars a Year

Twenty-five Cents a Copy

Canadian subscription, \$3.25 a Year

Foreign subscription, \$3.50 a Year

Volume X

NOVEMBER, 1921

Number 3

EDITORIAL COMMENT

The Ambition for Sanctity

WHEN S. Francis Xavier was canonized, Francis de Sales—then a young man—is reported to have said to a friend: "There are already three saints of my name; I must make a fourth, though it cost me my life." Needless to say, he attained his ambition!

The modern world would scoff at such an ambition. We think it nothing strange that a young man should strive for the highest possible rank in the army or the navy; or that musicians and artists should aim at perfection in their art. Why then should it be looked upon as anomalous or eccentric when a young man consciously exerts himself to attain the goal of a perfect character? Our Lord commanded us to aim at perfection: "Be ye there-

fore perfect, as your Father in heaven is perfect." The Holy Spirit most assuredly has that aim in His sanctifying work within us. Why should we not cooperate with Him?

What holds us back from the toil and sacrifice that are the necessary conditions for growth in sanctity? In many cases perhaps it is the lure of the world and the flesh. If so, it might be well for us to ask those who have given their souls in exchange for the pleasures of the world and the flesh, whether in the long run they have been pleased with their bargain. It is best to consult those who have grown old in that service. It often takes men of the world a long time to become convinced of the worthlessness of the world's prizes. The intellectualist makes the discovery much sooner. The saint learns the secret the most quickly of all, by taking God's word for it, and actually being crucified with Christ to the world.

The saints have given up all for God. They have played for the highest stakes and they have won!

It is sobering to think of the vast multitude of mortals who have passed, like sheep unconscious of their destiny, along the way from birth to death. How petty and vain the aims of many of them have been,—money, pleasure, fame, influence! How immeasurably superior the ambition to be a saint! The quest for perfection is the only rational aim, the only explanation that can give an intelligible meaning to these few fleeting years of our life in this world.

On Letting People Alone

AMONG the arts that we most need to learn in our churches is the art of letting people alone. One can scarcely enter the average Anglican Church without being pounced upon by one of the clergy or an usher or the sex-

ton or the vergers. If one does manage to slink into a pew without being caught, some good woman insists on handing one a prayer book or hymnal, open at the proper place.

We can quite understand how people of the average degree of timidity, who have been so elaborately served and perhaps in addition have been asked to fill out a questionnaire with their name, age, names of parents, birthplace, previous religious affiliation, and so forth, would soberly resolve never to enter a church again.

Things are not done quite so efficiently in the places which the people frequent in large numbers: the movies, the out-door concerts, the parks, the ocean beaches, soap-box orations, department stores, or Roman Catholic churches. There a man can enter as he pleases, roam about at his own sweet will, and come away in peace, without officious people intruding into his private affairs.

It is a grave question whether it is best for the clergy to stand at the door of the church to shake hands with people as they go out. It is commonly praised as indicative of cordial hospitality. There are many strangers, however, who do not like it, particularly when the clergy jot down their names and addresses in a little book. The ideal method would seem to be that the clergy should be standing near the door so as to be approachable to anyone who wishes to meet them or ask for spiritual ministrations, without attempting to speak to everybody. No sensible person goes to church simply to be welcomed by the clergy.

The best managed department stores show their wisdom by allowing people, whether prospective buyers or not, to come in and wander about looking at what they like. If they express a desire to be waited on, a clerk is always at their service.

That should be the policy of the Church. People should be permitted to come in and stand up if they want to, or

kneel down to pray, or sit in a pew to listen,—either during public worship or at any other time. It is conducive to prayer outside of public worship to have the church dimly lighted. People should be encouraged to bring their babies if they want to, in their arms or in baby-carriages,—even at eleven o'clock on Sunday mornings. The clergy should be available if people want to see them.

This may not fulfil the ideal of the parish recently set forth in an authoritative bulletin: "Every member a worshipper, every worshipper a worker, every worker a giver, every giver a spiritual force." That is a bit too efficient for a parish of the Catholic Church. Some worshippers must be permitted to remain only worshippers for a time, before being drawn into the system and enlisted as workers, definitely tagged and catalogued.

Knowledge of Ceremonial

HIGH Churchmen are often taunted with laying too much stress on the externals of worship and religion. They are dubbed "ritualists." They are compared to the Pharisees of old who thought only of the outside of the cup and the platter. The real truth of the matter is that they do not lay enough stress on these things. They are too often slovenly and ignorant in their ceremonial practices. They are badly in need of a more accurate and scholarly knowledge of ceremonial.

Perhaps the majority of our clergy want to conduct the worship for which they are responsible in a dignified and beautiful manner, and in keeping with the ceremonial customs of the Catholic Church. They have never been properly instructed in these matters, nor have they seriously attempted to master the science of ceremonial for themselves. Perhaps they have thought it would be wrong

to spend any time on a study of the mere externals of religion. In lieu of that they have picked up scraps of information through what they have seen in their visits to churches where things are done as they should be. In some cases they have adopted practices which were not correct through visiting the wrong kind of churches. In other cases they have corrupted, unconsciously or through a desire to improve, the practices which they have observed in the right kind of churches.

In any case, as we go about the country, we are struck by the bizarre ceremonial which is practiced by many priests, especially in their celebration of the Holy Mysteries. One priest genuflects at the Sanctus; another prostrates himself and almost touches his head to the floor as he makes his communion; another extends his arms in the form of a cross throughout the whole action; another gives benediction with the Blessed Sacrament when he turns around to give the people the Holy Communion. We have even heard of a priest who when he said the Prayer of Humble Access pretended to be gathering up the crumbs on the floor in front of the altar! It is needless to say that there is no authority for such usages in Western Christendom. We do not pretend to know what they do in the East.

Of course our seminaries should train men in ceremonial as well as other departments of priestcraft. Then when they have parishes of their own they will not be so likely to make themselves ridiculous. But if a priest has not been properly instructed in the knowledge of Catholic ceremonial at the seminary, he should lose no time in getting hold of an authoritative book on the subject and making a thorough study of the whole question. There is no reason why we should be ignorant of the external side of religion any more than the internal. Our Lord gave us the

sacraments and a form of prayer. God made the human body as well as the soul. He also made the shell of the acorn as well as the kernel—and where would the kernel be without the shell? There is no virtue in just muddling through the worship of God. “God is not the author of confusion.” Therefore “let all things be done decently and in order.”

The Presbyterians and the Lambeth Appeal

THE Pan-Presbyterian Alliance, meeting at Pittsburgh in September, issued a pronouncement welcoming steps toward the reunion of Christendom, but insisting that there can be no progress toward reunion until the conferring churches recognize one another's church standing; or, in other words, until the Anglican Church does not require additional ordination of Nonconformist clergymen. The pronouncement was presented by the Rev. Dr. Carnegie Simpson of Cambridge, England. The following paragraph from the pronouncement is quoted from the *New York Times* of September 22:

The Council records its opinion that such conference must be as between churches meeting on equal terms and must be unrestricted as to all questions of ecclesiastical order. Further, its members are at one in declaring their conviction that there will be substantial progress toward reunion only when the conferring churches are ready frankly to recognize one another's church standing, and to accompany words of unity by acts of unity in the fellowship of the Lord's Table, and in co-operation in the Lord's work.

Which goes to show that the words of the Lambeth Appeal have not been carefully weighed. Certainly the Bishops said all that anyone could wish in the way of recognizing the church standing of every Christian denomination. As for demanding re-ordination it was expressly put on a conditional basis; and the Bishops said that our

clergy should equally be willing to accept conditional reordination at the hands of Presbyterians, Orthodox Easterners, and Roman Catholics. It is to us inconceivable that anyone who really wants unity should object to conditional reordination at the hands of any hierarchy in the world that might question the validity of his orders, if that act would forward the cause of unity.

The Situation in Palestine

THE average American Christian has only a vague notion of what is happening in the Holy Land. He knows that during the war it was conquered by the British under General Allenby, for that was in all the newspapers. Perhaps he knows also that in the peace settlements Great Britain has been given the mandate to govern Palestine. He therefore feels comfortable and happy about the outcome: that at last, after all these centuries of waiting, the Holy Land has come under the benignant sway of Christianity. What those foolish, impetuous Crusaders of the middle ages fought for out of due time, has finally been effected in a sane, modern fashion by the efficient British army. The land where Christ was born and lived and died has now come under the control of a Christian power. The Cross has triumphed over the Crescent!

It would be well for the average American Christian to awake from his dreams and acquaint himself with the facts. The Cross has not triumphed. The Holy Land has not come under the sway of Christianity, for the simple reason that the Christian government of England has seen fit to hand Palestine over to the Jews. Mr. Lloyd George has caused Sir Herbert Samuel, a Jew, to be appointed High Commissioner. The poorer Jews of northern Europe are now being encouraged to emigrate to Palestine by the help of Anglo-Jewish money. By the terms of the man-

date Great Britain is pledged to make Palestine the Jewish national home.

What of it, asks the average American Christian, does not Palestine belong to the Jews? Has it not been their land for two thousand years? Why shouldn't they have it now? For the simple reason that it belongs chiefly to the Arabs,—both Moslem and Christian. In 1912 there were in Palestine 78,000 Jews, against 600,000 Arabs (80,000 of these being Christians and the rest Moslems). By all the principles of self-determination Palestine is an Arab nation, with a scattered population of Jews and Christians forming a distinct minority. The Christians have remained loyal to their faith through centuries in spite of cruel persecution. The French government has exercised the protectorate for the Catholic interests. By the terms of the mandate that is now terminated.

What wonder that at present in Palestine the British are hated by everybody except the Jews,—by the French, the Arabs, the Christians, and the Mohammedans. The Jews love them for the enemies they have made. The Moslems and Christians, who have been age-long enemies, have been reconciled and banded together by their common danger. It was a golden opportunity which Mr. Lloyd George had, such as comes once in a millenium, to appoint a Christian governor for Palestine. The Arabs would have welcomed him with open arms. The magnificent cause for which so many saintly men laid down their lives during the Crusades would at last have triumphed, with the Moslems as friends rather than enemies. But it was not to be!

One of the most illuminating and interesting books that we have seen on the Jewish question is "The New Jerusalem," by Mr. G. K. Chesterton. He sees things pretty straight and is not afraid to tell what he sees. It is moreover one of the best things he has done, and we cordially recommend it to our readers.

The Re-Organized Churchmen's Alliance

THE Churchmen's Alliance, in its re-organized form, has placed all its executive power in the hands of laymen. This has been done in the hope of awakening the laity to a sense of their power and responsibility in promoting the work of the Church. This in itself, we believe, makes the Alliance a unique organization. Distinctly Catholic in character, it aims to be what its name indicates, an *alliance* of the various groups in our communion which are working towards a common end. It is in no sense a rival of such confraternities, leagues, and guilds as exist to promote a single cause, for it does not profess to be primarily a devotional body. It demands of course the regular prayers of its members, but it exists to spread the knowledge of the Catholic faith and to stimulate the Catholic life in all its aspects. It is, indeed, a union, and asks all who believe in its aims to become active members. It arranges for lectures and conferences, disseminates Catholic literature, and has its own organ, the *Alliance Bulletin*, which appears, at present, every other month.

The progress of the Catholic movement thus far in our communion has been largely parochial. The Alliance hopes by means of its various activities to give corporate expression to the desire of the laity for the full privileges of the Catholic life, and to give confidence and stimulus to priests and laymen who are working far from their natural friends and allies. If the Alliance can have the co-operation of all the Catholic-minded in America, it may in time become a natural spokesman for its members, and a **force** for the propagation of the faith. In proportion as it moves towards that ideal, it will have justified its existence.

Catholic Character

RT. REV. RICHARD H. NELSON, D.D.

IN approaching a subject which is fundamental to a true idea of the Church's life and mission, it may be assumed that sincere Christians will accept the following propositions. First, it is desirable that all mankind should be united in obedience to the will of God. Second, the central verities of the Christian Faith, handed down from Apostolic times, and the operations of God's grace which have been tested by centuries of human experience, must furnish the foundations of the spiritual building in which the family of God may gather. The Catholic Religion and the Catholic Church must be in harmony with the mind of God, and must supply the spiritual needs of men.

Reverence and a sense of our human limitations lead us to speak with hesitation concerning the mind of God. A great bishop and teacher once remarked that "anyone who ventures to explain the mind of God betrays an abysmal degree of infatuated impertinence." Recognizing the danger of such presumption, it may nevertheless be permitted to set forth, as a basis of argument, whatever God has revealed explicitly concerning His purpose toward mankind, and the beginning of this revelation appears in the inspired story of creation. "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness." "So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him." It is difficult to assign a precise meaning to these words, but we reach firm ground when we consider their explanation in the Gospel of the Incarnation. In the Epistle to the Hebrews we read that "God hath spoken unto us by His Son," who is "the express image of His person," and St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Ephesians (chapter four), sets forth as the ultimate purpose of the

“one Body and one Spirit” that we should “come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, under the measure of his stature of the fulness of Christ.”

It would be well if everyone who desires the progress of the Catholic Religion would study this fourth chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians as a treatise on Catholic character. It declares that they who would “grow up into Him in all things which is the Head, even Christ” must not “walk as other Gentiles walk in the vanity of their mind.” They are not to give themselves over unto lasciviousness and uncleanness, but are to put off the corruption of the old man and to be renewed in the spirit of their mind. They are to overcome the temptation to anger. They must not steal, but must labor honestly and diligently. No corrupt communication may proceed from their lips. Bitterness, wrath, anger and clamor are to be put away from them with all malice. They must be kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another even as God, for Christ’s sake hath forgiven them. In short, Catholic character is the imitation of Christ, who is the express image of the Father’s Person.

Closely related to this obvious but frequently neglected truth is the fact that Catholic character was a powerful instrument in the hand of God in winning the world from pagan culture to the Christian Religion. The Word of God spoke to such as were willing to receive Him, and, in many cases, these were persuaded to accept the Gospel because they perceived the fruits of the divine Spirit in the lives of His followers. It is not presumptuous to say that the mind and will of God toward the inhabitants of the earth today is that they should be united by the Holy Spirit in the knowledge of that truth which develops the image of God in men and causes them to grow into Catholic character. As, on the Day of Pentecost, representatives

of many nations heard the Word of God, each in the tongue wherein he was born, so, in the unity for which we pray, every man shall hear and speak the universal language of the true life, growing with others "unto an holy temple in the Lord."

First then we are to "contend for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints." This does not mean that we are merely to hold the faith as necessary to salvation, nor does it mean that we are to be of a contentious spirit, condemning all who reject the Gospel or who fail to perceive its life-giving power. We are to contend for the faith as a vitalizing force which propels men toward the image of God. The Creed is something more than a symbol of the truth, it is the chart and compass of the Catholic life. It is a summary of God's dealings with men in the processes of Creation, Redemption and Sanctification, setting forth by implication what man must do to bring himself into harmony with the purposes of God. It is "a form of sound words," and it is also an incentive to spiritual effort. For this reason it has its rightful place in every act of worship, and notably in the Holy Eucharist, which is the divine drama of our life in and toward God. When the Creed is recited by the congregation, it is not merely a statement of objective truth, but it is also an "act of faith" which involves the dedication of ourselves to the purpose for which God made us, redeemed us through Christ, and strives to sanctify us by His Holy Spirit. In a very true sense, it represents our "marching orders." We who believe must act according to our belief. We must go forth from the house of God and let our light so shine before men that they may behold our good works and glorify our Father which is in heaven. The test of reality in our belief and worship is found in its influence upon our character. The Catholic Faith must be a dynamic force, transforming our lives according to the everlasting

purpose of Him who made us in His image.

As we thus contend for the faith, so do we hold fast to that idea of the Sacred Ministry which we believe to be in accordance with the mind and will of God. A duly authenticated priesthood is essential to the unity of the Church, and we are justified in guarding that which has been committed to our stewardship, but we must not forget that the ideal of priesthood is inseparable from personal character. God's priests must be clothed with righteousness if His saints are to sing with joyfulness, and their white garments must symbolize the character which they seek as representatives of a priestly people. Our High Priest is "holy, harmless, undefiled," and they who act for Him must model their lives upon His.

One of the saddest facts in the history of religion is the lapse from priestly character on the part of those who have been ordained to uphold it before the people. In the days of Eli, a corrupt priesthood marked and hastened the moral decline which led to national disaster. So, too, when our Lord came to His temple, they who held the highest places in the hierarchy were the leaders of opposition to Him. "Woe unto the world because of offences, for it must needs be that offences come, but woe unto that man by whom the offence cometh." The priest should remember the solemn words which were addressed to him at his ordination: "The Church and congregation whom you must serve is His Spouse and His Body. And if it shall happen that any member thereof do take any hurt or hindrance by reason of your negligence, ye know the greatness of the fault, and also the horrible punishment that will ensue." May there not be an allusion to this danger in the eighth chapter of the Book of Revelation at verses ten and eleven? "And the third angel sounded, and there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it were a lamp, and it fell upon the third part of the rivers,

and upon the fountains of waters; and the name of the star is called Wormwood: and the third part of the waters became wormwood; and many men died of the waters, because they were made bitter."

There is considerable prejudice today against the name and idea of priesthood, and this may be due in large measure to abuses of the sacred office in former times; but we dare not blind our eyes to the possibility of similar evil in our own generation. At times the world condemns thoughtlessly or in ignorance; but, on the whole, its judgments are fair, and the priest who represents the spirit of his Lord in his personal life and in his relations to others seldom fails to win confidence and respect. If he is an example of Catholic character, he becomes a power for righteousness, and wins men to the faith whose fruit they see in his life.

In like manner the Sacraments have for their main object the production of Catholic character. They were ordained to impart and to sustain the God-life in man, which is merely a way of saying that they are designed to transform men into the image of God.

"Baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ and to be made like unto Him."

In the Holy Eucharist we offer ourselves to God as a living sacrifice in union with the one perfect sacrifice of Christ, desiring and seeking to be conformed to His likeness. We make our communion in order "that He may dwell in us and we in Him." This cannot mean that we are merely to find rest in Him. It means that we are to work in Him and He in us toward the "prize of our high calling," and the goal to which we press is the character of which He is the one perfect example.

Here it seems proper to say a few words about the devotional value and the effective power of the Reserved

Sacrament. Wherever the Sacrament is reserved for the sick, its spiritual use must extend beyond the convenience of ministering to those who cannot come to church. It will not do to say that the danger of abuse outweighs the possibility of benefit. There was danger in the Incarnation, because it afforded opportunity to reject as well as to receive Him who "came unto His own." The Incarnation is God's great adventure into the life of man, and the sacramental system cannot be free from the peril which accompanies every opportunity.

The Reserved Sacrament should be a potent means of building the character which has been described as Catholic. Consider, for a moment, how easily and how generally we forget and fail to act upon the truth that God is everywhere present and that all life is sacramental. Theoretically we recognize the divine Presence in all that possesses life, from the humblest plant to the neighbor who, like ourselves, is made in the image of God. If we were capable of remembering this truth at all times, and if it were the active principle which governs our thoughts, words and actions, we might, perhaps, have no need of a special sacrament to recall it to our minds. As a matter of fact, we seldom remember that God is everywhere present, and we do not always think of Him as represented in the lives of those with whom we come in daily contact. For this reason there is a tremendous spiritual value in that which recalls our wandering thoughts and centers them in the Presence which we call sacramental.

We may not venture to linger in that Presence for any selfish end, nor chiefly that we may find rest and refreshment from the cares and trials of life. We desire to be with our Lord in order that we may renew our sense of responsibility to become like unto Him, and in order that we may rekindle our zeal for His service. If we shall go forth from the Sacramental Presence to realize that God

is everywhere, and to recognize Him in each one of His brethren whom we may meet in the various walks of life, then we shall turn devotion into action and we shall grow up into Him in all things which is the Head, even Christ, the express image of the Father's Person.

The earnest striving for Catholic character will lead us away from a merely contentious spirit, and will commend our interpretation of the Catholic religion by proving to others that it has the reality which the world recognizes in our Lord Jesus Christ.

Recent Utterances on Church Unity

REV. LUCIUS WATERMAN, D.D.

1. *The Call to Unity*: Rt. Rev. W. T. Manning, D.D. New York. The Macmillan Co. 1920. (\$2.00; pp. 162.)
2. *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*: Rev. Prof. A. C. Headlam, D.D. London, Longmans, Green & Co. 1920. (\$4.00 net; pp. 318.)
3. *Approaches Toward Church Unity*: Edited by Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D., and Rev. Prof. Williston Walker, D.D. Yale University Press, 1919. (\$1.25; pp. 170.)
4. *Christian Unity: Its Principles and Possibilities*: Edited by Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. New York, Association Press, 1921. (\$2.85; pp. 386.)
5. *The Problem of Christian Unity*: Seven Writers. New York, The Macmillan Co. 1921. (\$1.75; pp. 121.)
6. *Towards Reunion*: By Church of England and Free Church Writers. London, The Macmillan Co. 1919. (7/6; pp. 383.)

7. *Report of Lambeth Conference*: Official Publication. New York, The Macmillan Co. 1920 (80 cts; pp. 161.)
8. *Lambeth and Reunion*: By the Bishops of Peterborough, Zanzibar, and Hereford. New York, The Macmillan Co. 1921. (\$1.60; pp. 115.)
9. *The Problem of Reunion*: Rev. L. J. Walker, S.J. London, Longmans, Green & Co. 1920. (\$4.50 net; pp. 255.)

I.

HERE are nine books in all of which we feel the breathing of the Breath of God. There is much of error and confusion. The speech is the speech of Babel even yet, but the writers have all caught glimpses of Jerusalem from afar, and long to realize the Vision of Peace. The books themselves are a hopeful sign. Fifty years ago Denominationalism had its prophets everywhere, while the vision of a united Church was mocked as "an iridescent dream."

Today Denominationalism is discredited. The waste and shame of divisions among Christians have been held up before men till they have really touched the popular heart. It has come to be felt that he who divides Christ is an anti-christ. That solemn conviction is spreading from the few to the many. The passion for unity seems likely to sweep over a great part of the Christian world of today, very much as the passion for the recovery of the Holy Land swept over Western Europe, eight centuries ago. The crusades did great good and great harm. The Unity movement may do both good and harm on a great scale. It is, in its purpose, a movement to lead men to love and serve one another. It needs profoundly so to be guided that it shall bring men to understand one another. Even the supreme excellence of love needs the guidance of heavenly wisdom. Our nine volumes show that fulness of understanding is still very far to seek.

II.

Persons who think at all about the subject of Church Unity—few can escape thinking a little about it just now!—may be divided into three classes. There are (1) those who have not yet learned to care about such unity, (2) those who care deeply as a matter of emotional concern, and have (on the intellectual side) no convictions which need hinder them from complete union with any other man of earnestly religious mind, and (3) those who care deeply for unity, but have, as a matter of fact, strong convictions about some elements of truth or duty, which convictions are, as things now stand, divisive. The first class may be dismissed from our view. They are a very important group, an inert mass in the Body of Christ, just when our Lord is calling upon His Body to function actively. But when they are converted they will fall at once into one of the two other groups just named, and it is by the interaction of these groups that the movement for Reunion will be made or marred. This great Reform of the Church of Christ is in more danger from those who are eager to promote it than from those who are still indifferent to it. That may seem a paradox. But of such paradoxes the world is full. Our greatest danger is from those who care passionately for our great cause.

These two groups of those who care greatly may be labelled with the letters "A" and "B," and those letters may stand for the words "And" and "But" in two phrases that need to be held up before men's minds insistently. The first is—

"It is the Lord's will that His Church should be visibly one,—*And* we must give up our foolish strifes and let Him have His will."

The other is—

"It is the Lord's will that His Church should be visibly

one;—*But* we cannot give Him His will, till He shows us a way to agree about some matters, as now we are unable to agree.”

The great difference between class A and class B is just this: Class A regards our present divisions simply as a sin committed by Christians, of which they have only to repent, and then of course they can put it away. “We are all working under a common inspiration,” says this group, “and we have only to recognize one another’s inspiration, and pull together in our common cause.” Class B, on the other hand, regards our divisions as a dreadful disaster, a disaster brought about largely by men’s sins, certainly, but permitted by Almighty God to fall on us, and one out of which we cannot deliver ourselves until by prayer, and by study, and by special gifts of God’s grace, we are enabled to remove the causes of this disaster. “We are building,” says class B, “upon a divine foundation, a revelation of faith and order given us by our Lord Himself, and which many of our Lord’s people have lost out of sight. We cannot build with these our brethren unless we can agree in building on the foundation laid down for us by our Lord.” Class A holds that our trouble is only one of mean tempers and unloving hearts. Class B insists that part of our difficulty lies in error of men’s minds, and the removal of error in God’s order of human life is a work that takes time.

III.

It may occur to some readers that there is no “Class A,” as here defined. There is a group of Protestants whose “common Protestantism” is a very small common denominator, but when men are arguing for the necessity of Church Reunion, they are careful to commit themselves to an appeal for the bringing into organization of all who “acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ as a Divine Saviour.” Yet here two points are to be observed. (1) Many who

are ready to respond to this formula do not, as a matter of fact, acknowledge our Lord as "Divine" in the sense of the Catholic Church. The Nicene doctrine of the Trinity is not held by Congregationalists, and one often hears in such circles such a phrase as "I recognize in Jesus the divinity that is in all men." (2) Some of those who are now seeking to unify all who acknowledge our Lord as "Divine," quite in the Catholic sense, yet make no secret of the fact that the exclusion of Unitarians is only an *ad interim* exclusion. In one of the volumes before us* we find these words from a Presbyterian divine of the modernist type, Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin:

"With regard to our non-Evangelical brethren, while we admire their genuine Christianity, at the present time it does not seem to be a feasible thing to bind them into a practical unity with ourselves without sacrificing larger sections of the Evangelical Christians today, so that for the time being, no doubt, we shall have to go on without them."

Here it is made very plain what the sentimental appeal for Unity is coming to. We ought to be large-minded enough, Dr. Coffin holds, to admit Unitarians into the fellowship of the one Church. "We admire," he says, "their genuine Christianity." All high-minded and sweet-natured people, apparently, are to be regarded as "genuine Christians." Certainly there is an important group of men of deep religious earnestness who are calling loudly for a union of all men who have religious earnestness quite irrespective of their religious beliefs. They say that they want all the forces that our Lord values and blesses to come together and work as one great united force. That sounds well. Let us see how it will work. Doubtless, our Lord, who loves all men, and lightens every man coming

**The Problem of Christian Unity*, p. 101.

into the world, does then love and value many Jews, His near kinsmen according to the flesh, and many Buddhists, and many high-minded infidels. Logically, this argument about "love" and "value" and "blessing" requires that the united Church of the future should open its arms lovingly to non-Christians of the nobler types. Oh! yes! There really is a "Class A."

IV.

Our object in setting out these two classes of thinkers is not at all to argue which of them is right. It is simply to make clear the difficulties of the present situation. Class A and Class B with their different convictions will have very different duties. For instance, it may be set down that all the forces which work for good in the world should as much as possible unite. That is really a truism. Then members of Class A, having no conscientious scruples to hold them back from complete union in religious work with all men who have an earnest religious purpose, should try to bring about a union of all men who care for religion without any distinction of creed or method. Or if they belong personally to the ranks of Evangelical Protestantism and find that the largest possible work of simplification now open to them is that of endeavoring for a sort of loosely Evangelical Pan-Protestantism, then they ought to endeavor to bring about *that* result. It is their plain duty. It is a pressing duty. But Class A must not be so dull-witted as to press upon the members of Class B that this same liberality of union is *their* duty likewise. Plainly it is not. Members of Class B *have* scruples of conscience which forbid them to enter into complete union with any professed followers of our Lord who do not accept from our Lord certain messages and orders which He is understood to have sent them. They cannot enter into such a union. For them it would be a sin.

This is an unhappy division certainly, whichever party

is right about the issue. But the division is a great fact, and must not be ignored. While we are trying—we ought all to be trying—to bring the men and women who are eager to work for God in the world into a better unity of cooperation, and even into a unity of organization for worship and service, it is manifestly our first duty to bring all these workers to love one another, with the same love with which God loves us all. Next it is our plain duty to try to understand one another. If we grow in loving and understanding one another, it is certain that we shall more and more respect one another. Certainly, also, each party must learn that it cannot force its conscience upon the other party. Neither party may say to the other party, “We *must* have unity, and therefore you must give up your position and come over to ours.” Love and understanding and mutual respect, and clear recognition of barriers of conscience over which we can as yet see no way to pass—these are our present needs. From the recognition of the needs comes a test and measure of the value of such books as we have now to pass in review.

V.

“Utterances on Church Unity” fall into three great types. They may be *hortatory*, urging the need of a united Church, and showing the fatal weakness of a Kingdom divided against itself. They may be *controversial*, trying to show how unreasonable some of the conditions of unity are on which some consciences insist, or, on the other hand, how deeply necessary those same conditions are. They may be *constructive*, facing the present facts of differing and even warring convictions, and trying to show some steps which may really be taken now, without any violation of any present conscience, to make *some* conditions better than they are. As an introduction to the examination of particular volumes, it may be worth while to

say something about the strength and weakness of these three types of utterance.

1) The *hortatory* utterance is strong in this, that it calls on men to want something which our Lord Himself wants, to enter into sympathy with His mind and heart. The writer of these lines owes it to men whom he will have to criticize more or less severely to say that while he had supposed himself to be an enthusiast in this cause for fifty years, and to have a passion like Bishop Brent's* for Unity, yet he is conscious that the appeals which he has been reading in the volumes now under review have touched his heart and conscience, as they have never been touched before. That is something that needs doing. The appeals of men whose hearts are on fire with this vision are really helping to do it.

But we may not shut our eyes to the elements of weakness to which the hortatory utterance is liable. There is first the danger that in dealing with those of us who have to be conscientious objectors to reunion schemes they will stir up bitterness instead of increasing love. When a man sees no reason why all good people should not get together in one Church, and does see a tremendous need of it, it is very hard for him to be patient with the people who stand out for things that seem to him of no value, or even to do such people simple justice. But a greater danger of the hortatory utterance is the danger of a shallow optimism. The appeal cries out that a "divided Church can never conquer the world," and goes on to the conclusion that we *must* have a united Church. Then it offers in fact, some kind of Pan-Protestantism as an object for which any sacrifice would be worth while. But if all our divisions were reduced to three, a great Protestant Communion, the

*"If there is any one thing for which I have a passion, it is for the unity of the Church in accordance with the mind of Christ." (Bp. Brent in *Approaches Towards Church Unity*, p. 109.)

Roman and the Eastern Orthodox, we should still come far short of the "United Church" of the great vision, and should not, we think, be visibly nearer to converting the world. That tremendous witness of one Church of God would still not be forthcoming. The appeal which we need must acknowledge that we are standing before a Red Sea of difficulty, which nothing less than a miracle can divide. Then it can rightly urge men to pray for the miracle, and importune God for it till it comes. The appeal that meets these demands is rare.

(2) The *controversial* utterance has value as far as it is held to a frank and kindly statement of a *minimum* of necessary beliefs or a *minimum* of required order which a particular group of Christians feel bound to insist on as necessary to meet what these Christians understand to be our Lord's requirements for His Church. Great advantage comes to our Roman brethren from the fact that their position in this business is thoroughly understood. Nobody is angry with them about it. Nobody expects them to change it. It is one of the great fixed facts of the world's life. We Anglican Catholics need to gain for ourselves a like advantage, and moreover we owe it to our Protestant brethren to make our position unmistakably clear. The fact that the Anglican Communion at this moment includes a large membership called "divisive," and another large membership which has *not* such scruples, is to our Protestant friends confusing. Many of them cherish a hope that the great Anglican Communion will with the advance of education learn wisdom enough to get off the fence, and come down on the Protestant side. That will not be. To save waste of time, disappointment, irritation among our Protestant neighbors it is needful to make them understand this great fact: the Anglican Communion does not require men to accept all our Catholic principles—it does require *all* men to accept *some* of them;

—but *the Anglican Communion will never disregard our Catholic principles*. What is true of Anglican Catholics is true of all conscientious objectors in this endeavor after unity. It is their first duty, and one of their chief contributions to the cause, to make their scruples clear, and make them *felt*. In performing that service writing which may be called “controversial” is of real use.

But more commonly the controversial utterance is simply an endeavor by one thinker to change another thinker’s mind. Any scholar who cares to publish a book intended to change other scholars’ minds has a right to do it. But let him not suppose that he can do anything to promote Reunion in any way. The thing has been tried for centuries, and it has done very little good. Take Dr. Headlam’s recent Bampton Lectures, for example. They are put forth distinctly as a contribution to this cause and as such a contribution they are *nil*. They will give much pleasure to Protestants as showing that an Anglican scholar reads his Church History through Protestant spectacles. It is not likely that they will ever convert any man from the Catholic to the Protestant side. Argument in favor of one set of views as against another is not the need of the hour.

(3) What we do need is something constructive, and by a *constructive utterance* we mean one that tries to show men seriously interested in this subject something that they can really do to help the cause. The measure of the strength or weakness of any such proposals is the measure in which they face facts. A programme that is not true to facts is so far weak. It may be unfortunately weak. It may be dangerously weak. As an example of (a) the weakness that is simply unfortunate, we may take the proposal made by our own Church for a world-wide conference on Faith and Order. It was a noble vision, and it had real promise. It depended for most of its value

on a nearly universal acceptance. The Pope refused the invitation, and the Christian forces of the world will come into conference with the largest Christian Communion in the world left out. The proposal was honorable and wise. It was discovered to be weak at a most critical point. On the other hand, it has reserves of strength, and it may be a means of doing a great service to the world. As an example of (b) the weakness that is dangerous we must hold up the action taken by our Anglican Bishops at the last Lambeth Conference. We are not now criticizing the scheme which those fathers so nearly unanimously adopted for dealing with the facts which they thought they had before them. We are simply questioning what they plainly assumed to be facts. It is quite certain that in offering the Protestant Churches a proposal for a union based on the acceptance of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the Bishops at Lambeth were assuming that the Churches to which they thus addressed themselves did really believe those Creeds. The Bishops cannot be imagined to have asked those Churches to profess the Catholic Creeds *without* believing them, which would have been an immoral suggestion, or to have asked these churches suddenly to change their minds and accept from these Anglican teachers a body of belief which they had not held before, which would have been an utterly foolish suggestion. But this optimistic notion, that the members of the Protestant Churches, universally or with just negligible exceptions, believe the Catholic Creeds, is simply contrary to fact. The evidence for this statement of ours is much plainer in America than in England and Scotland. Our American Bishops ought to have borne testimony to that very important fact. We feel no doubt that some of them did bear such testimony. But even in England the fact is manifest enough to demand an attention which it did not receive. It is a matter of weakness, and of most dangerous weakness,

to offer men as a basis of union a Creed in which they notoriously do not agree.

VI.

We have been saying that a policy which is to be genuinely constructive must face facts. That is not to say that such a policy may not try experiments and may not make voyages of discovery. That invitation to the Pope to send representatives to a conference on Faith and Order is a good example. There was reason to fear that he would refuse. That he would refuse was not an ascertained fact. It was a great duty to send the invitation, and see what would come of it. Now we have the fact before us. Our policies must henceforth take account of that fact along with other facts established in various ways. It may be worth while to set down some of these facts, which framers of policies should keep before them.

(1) Our first fact is that the *complete* unifying of Christendom is at present out of the question. The inflexible attitude of the Roman Communion and the impossibility that the rest of Christians should, with their present conscience, submit to the Roman claims together make that point clear beyond gainsaying. Furthermore, to write as if a union of all Protestants was going to be a union of all Christians is only humbugging people. We must face facts to the extent of turning our attention confessedly to *partial* reunions, which shall have the value at any rate of (a) teaching men the *habit* of uniting, and (b) forming in them a disposition to give up all divisions that are not matters of necessity.

(2) When we are looking for partial reunions, there seems to be a possibility—to say the least, there is no patent impossibility—of bringing about inter-communion and union between the Anglican Communion and the Orthodox Eastern Churches. This is no light matter nor one that can be expected to come to any speedy settlement.

But here is *something that can be done*,—the kindly approach, the word of explanation, the honest endeavor on both sides to find sufficiency of common ground. That “something” *ought* to be done. That is one of the conspicuous facts that need facing.

(3) But another conspicuous fact is that just now there is no possibility of union between the Anglican Communion and the whole body of Protestant bodies which are in the habit of recognizing one another as Churches. (This “recognition” is now generally given to Unitarians, and cannot easily be withdrawn). And there is no present possibility of such a union between Anglicans and the more strictly “Evangelical” Churches. For besides the fact that these Churches are unwilling to enter into any union which would separate them from their present allies among other Protestant Churches, there are two important facts of belief which form an impassable barrier. There is the fact (*a*) that even Churches called “Evangelical” do not hold the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity—the Sabellian theory is very popular in American religion—nor the Catholic doctrine of the Deity of our Lord, and there is the fact (*b*) that only rarely in the Protestant Churches will one find belief in the forgiveness of sins by way of sacrament. Few Protestant theologians “acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins” in the sense of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed.

(4) There are those who would insist that our fact (3) is no fact. An English Jesuit, Fr. Walker, whose book we must notice presently, says that the Church of England has no principles, and could take in all the “Free Churches” without any sacrifice of conviction whatever. “It is what it is—comprehensive, and the admission of the Nonconformist would neither make it more so nor less” (*The Problem of Reunion*, p. 134). Doubtless there are many Anglicans who would entirely agree with him. It re-

mains that the Anglican Communion has always claimed to hold to the Faith, the Orders, and the Sacraments of the Catholic Church, and while it admits to its membership, and even to its ministry men who do not count all these things to be necessary, it has always *acted as if they were necessary*. That brings us to our fourth point. Any attempt made by the Anglican Communion to treat any of these things as non-essential would *split the Anglican Communion in twain*. This is a fact that needs to be faced, and ought to be proclaimed widely. Probably there is not a thoughtful student of the subject of Reunion, Anglican or Protestant, who would not regard such a breach of unity as a grievous injury to the cause of unity in general. Where fact (4) is recognized, it will thoroughly establish fact (3).

(5) It remains that there is a great work of unifying to be done between Protestant Churches separated by small differences rather than large, and in fact, by differences which are not now (whatever they may have been in the past) matters of "divisive conviction." We have had some examples of such unifying in Great Britain and in America. We may hope to see more. It may even come to pass that our present Federation of Churches will pass over into a Federated Church. If such a movement should be accomplished, our own position would be painful and difficult. But it would be our duty to rejoice and give thanks. For the cause of our Lord has everything to gain from an impressive teaching of the lesson that only by the command of God can men who seek the fellowship of God be justified in refusing fellowship to one another. The more our differences are reduced to clearly defined differences of conviction as to what is the revealed will of God, the more men will set themselves by study and prayer to find a way to some convincing settlement as to what that Will really is. We repeat our fifth fact. One of the chief duties of the

hour is to promote unity between Churches whose differences of conviction are small, between kindred members of the great Protestant group. Small steps first. That is the law of nature.

VII.

It remains to give a brief account of the books named at the head of this article.

(1) We give first place, as is meet, to Dr. Manning's "Call to Unity." It is mainly hortatory. It pleads the cause of unity earnestly, sweetly, and at times eloquently. It has also valuable constructive elements. It points out justly that unity does not at all require uniformity, neither ceremonial, liturgical, nor even administrative uniformity. He is constructive in pointing out that in our own Communion, Catholic-minded Catholics and Protestant-minded Catholics are living together in harmony, though they are far from agreement. But Dr. Manning does not come to grips with the real difficulties that Catholics feel in approaching the subject of reunion with Protestants. Take the matter of the Faith. Dr. Manning says on p. 30: "If complete agreement in matters of faith were a prerequisite for unity, we might indeed despair, but unity imposes no such condition." He adds immediately that "those who live and work together in Christ must have a common faith in Him." What "common faith" is meant? We know that Dr. Manning is in the habit of proposing the acceptance of the Catholic Creeds as one of the foundations of unity. Does he mean that we need not ask men to agree completely as to the meaning of those Creeds? Did he write "matters of faith" carelessly, meaning matters of theological opinion? His book does not make such points clear, even to a friend, and such points should be made clear beyond the possibility of mistake. Or take the matter of Orders. We read on p. 101: "The ministry of each Christian denomination must be

recognized as a true ministry. Its spiritual reality and efficacy are proved by its power to lead men to Christ." Again we ask: "What does Dr. Manning mean?" Does he mean that because a man has proved himself a prophet, like Mr. Moody, for example, he is therefore proved to be a priest? Or does he mean that a Church can get along well enough with a prophetic minister, but without any priests? Does he mean, as his Protestant readers will understand him to mean, and as we do *not* understand him, that he would himself receive the Holy Communion from a Methodist or Congregationalist minister, believing that that reverend brother was giving what he never dreamed of giving to the faithful, the Body and Blood of our Lord? If Dr. Manning has had a change of mind so great as this, he ought to have told us so, so bluntly that we could no longer doubt. With much that is fine and winning in it, we feel that here is a book which does not face facts as definitely as the facts need to be faced.

(2) Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures have been sufficiently reviewed as a contribution to theology by Professor Jenks in the March number. Of its failure to contribute anything to the cause of Reunion we have spoken above (V. 2). Unity, if it ever comes, will be brought about, not by persuading men to agree about the Origins of the Ministry, but by getting them to unite on a basis of facts, *without* thinking alike.

(3) The next book, "Approaches Towards Church Unity," is largely an example of the same mistake. It begins with arguments in favor of certain Protestant views which Catholics do not seem likely ever to accept. Professor Williston Walker writes on the "Early Development of Church Officers," and we simply gasp to think that this eminent scholar can make this result out of the given facts. The same may be said of the paper on "Vital Principles of Church Development" by our well-beloved

brother, Dr. Newman Smyth. It strikes a new note in this long controversy by asking us to apply the discoveries of biology to our enquiries about the Body of Christ. Organisms, he shows us, have a wonderful power of developing new organs, new limbs, new enlargements. Nay, they can even make up for losses. They can evolve new arms, new legs, even new eyes. They can divide up into separate bodies, each animated with all the vital powers of the original. The moral is plain. The Church, the Body of Christ on earth, can make for itself a ministry. If it should lose its ministry entirely it could evolve another from within itself. It can multiply by fusion. Division is not schism. Only quarrel can be *that*. This is most interesting, surely; but when we look close at this biological study we make a startling discovery. These extraordinary powers of self-sufficiency belong to *none but very low forms of life*. "This capacity * * * seems to be a general property of the lower organisms," says Dr. Smyth (p. 50). "It diminishes as the organization becomes more highly differentiated." Quite so. The Protestant conception of the Church corresponds to the working of God's laws of life in life's lower forms, and the Catholic conception of the Church corresponds to the working of that law in life's higher forms. Which sort of form does the Body of Christ belong to? That of "a worm and no man" or that of a man, and a man glorified? We Catholics thank Dr. Smyth for his interesting study. We cannot make his use of it.

Of real constructive value are two papers by the Rev. Dr. Raymond Calkins. "The Historic Method of Approach" is an interesting study of two contrasted types of mind and experience, the Catholic type and the Protestant type, which are always to be found in human nature. It ought to do good to any reader, Protestant or Catholic. "The Place of the Creed in the Life of the Church" is an

eager plea for the restoration of the Apostles' Creed in the worship of the non-liturgical churches. It is also a plea that this great historical witness shall not be held to any definiteness of meaning. No one could make a finer plea than Dr. Calkins for his view, that "the man who insists on taking his creed literally is the one who truly does it violence." To us the paper proves, sorrowfully, just what "acceptance" of the Catholic creeds does, and does *not*, mean to some of our brethren most honored by us.

Bishop Brent contributes to this volume three pages, "Concerning Unity." We extract one sentence from page 111: "Perhaps our earliest duty is to sort out fundamentals from matters of indifference or second value." To that we say, "*Amen, Amen.*"

(4) "Christian Unity: Its Principles and Possibilities." This seems to us the most worth while of our four American books, and perhaps the most worth while of all the nine, this because more than in any other the writers set themselves to face the facts, and all the pertinent facts, of a difficult situation, and hold them up before American Christians so that any enquirers may think intelligently about them. The book proceeds from a Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook, which committee was called into action by the Federal Council and the War Work Commission of the Churches. It is frankly Protestant in its origin and in its viewpoint, but it is wisely constructive in purpose, statesmanlike in view and sane in recommendation. Part I. ("The Present Situation") has chapters on "The War and Christian Unity," on "The Present Situation in the Denominations" (seven leading churches reported from), on "The Present Status of Local Co-operation," (Rural Community Churches and State and Local Federations), on "The Present Situation in the Church as a Whole" (chapters I and IV come from Rob-

ert E. Speer), and an important chapter on "Present Problems in the Movement Toward Union" from Rev. Dr. William Adams Brown, dealing admirably with (a) factors which *impede* the movement, (b) factors which *further* it, (c) points of contact between differing attitudes (brief but particularly clear-sighted and wise), and (d) reflections on the bearings of these facts on different kinds of union now advocated by one and another—administrative union, federal union, organic union. Part II deals with "The Historical Background," showing what has been done in various ways in the past in getting divided forces to work together. Part III gives twenty pages to wise words about "Principles Which Underlie Further Progress." There is a valuable bibliography.

We have said that this book faces facts. It prints this defiant declaration of the Northern Baptists in 1919 (p. 75): "We do not believe in any form of sacerdotalism or sacramentalism among Christians, who are all equally priests of the Most High. With us ordination is only a formal recognition on the part of some local church that one of its members is judged worthy to serve as a pastor." The editors admit this astounding statement from an eminent Presbyterian (p. 77): "As the Holy Spirit is our teacher, it follows that all true Christians agree in faith." They allow Dr. Brown to tell us (p. 171) that "Christianity is not, in the belief of its adherents, a mere matter of private opinion and interpretation, but of divine revelation." These opinions are not wishy-washy. They are the utterances of men who do not propose to conceal difficulty or trifle with difficulty. The editors of this book know that some men have divisive convictions, and they mean to present them fairly and deal with them seriously. In one point, however, they made a regrettable mistake. If they meant to show an American public just where serious difficulties lie, they should have invited a represen-

tative Anglo-Catholic theologian to report on the attitude of the Episcopal Church. Instead of facing the facts right here, they invited Dean Washburn, of Cambridge, and he prophesied smooth things. He held up the Episcopal Church as a little paradise of indifference, in which Roman Catholics and Unitarians lie down together in sweet harmony, an example of the possibility of unity without agreement. We quote the Dean's own words (p. 86): "For some the Incarnation and the Virgin Birth are inseparable, for others they are separable; for certain types of mind Jesus is the perfect man and therefore one with God; for contrary types He is almost indistinguishable from God. Some worshippers regard the Trinitarian formula as the language of theological exactness, while others use the words because they describe, as well as words can, their religious emotions." * * * "To say that a man is an Episcopalian is by no means to indicate that he does, or does not, believe in baptismal regeneration." Now, this is not facing facts. There are, presumably, men among us who, when they baptize a child, say the words, "This child is regenerate," without in the least believing that they are true. We have priests who openly complain that the Church requires them to profess belief in things which no scholar can believe in the twentieth century. But these men are not honest men, and this Church of ours does not comprehend them. It simply *includes* them, as a man's body includes a cancer when he cannot afford a surgical operation. The holding of the Catholic faith by the American Episcopal Church, the insistence on such holding by members of all our three parties—High, Low, and Broad—is still a great outstanding fact of the religious situation in this country. It is a fact to be reckoned with. If our cancer spreads—which God forbid!—there may yet be an operation which will cost the Catholic patient a great deal of his property,

but it will not take his life. Let no American student suppose that our Church is a Church without any fundamentals. Dean Washburn's picture is a misleading picture in a book that is remarkable for showing things as they are.

(5) In saying that "The Problem of Christian Unity" is a *thin* book, we have said nearly all that we need say. It is a collection of seven lectures arranged by the Christian Unity Foundation. Lectures before general audiences are expected to be popular, and these do not seem to have taken this opportunity very seriously. Almost throughout the volume runs an unthoughtful assumption that there are no serious differences of belief or of conscience, among the Churches which are called "Evangelical." Some of the writers do not think that there are any essentials of belief. We have quoted above Dr. Coffin's admiration for the "genuine Christianity" of Unitarians. Dr. McGifford tells us (p. 47) that "of all the causes of discussion the belief in infallible truth, which one must know in order to be saved, has been the most potent." Our own Bishop Garland is quite sure that there are necessary beliefs, but he finds in the last fifteen years (p. 28) "unsuspected agreement in the essentials of the faith." He has also found out that whereas once there was a group who wanted Catholic Reunion (as with the East) before Protestant Reunion, *that* group "is now negligible" (p. 15). The best sentence in the book comes (p. 59) from Bishop McDowell (Methodist): "When a great body looks upon a special feature of its practice as commanded and enjoined by the New Testament, and by the example of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, no matter how far we may be from agreement with them in their conviction, every true man and woman will respect their conviction as a conviction, and not ask them lightly to wave it aside."

(6) "Toward Reunion" is a volume of fourteen essays, evenly divided between Church of England and Free Church writers, the outcome of conferences held at the great Congregationalist center, Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1918 and 1919. The papers of the Rev. Drs. P. T. Forsyth ("Unity and Theology"), A. E. Garvie ("The Reformed Episcopate"), J. Vernon Bartlet ("Corporate Authority"), and P. Carnegie Simpson ("Grace in Sacrament") are bracing readings. The first three are Congregationalists, and the fourth a Presbyterian. None is hazy, and all are worth while. When it comes to suggesting a constructive programme, their *non-possumus* is as flat as the Roman, so far as any dealing with Anglo-Catholics is concerned. To be sure, Dr. Forsyth sees (p. 71) that "difficulties must be worked out, not hustled out." . . . "Those who are most intractable to us, the best of the High Catholics, are not moved by sheer love of prerogative, prejudice, and obscurantism. Far from it. They have a charge to keep against even the piety, or fraternity, or democracy of the hour." But he is sure that only on the foundation of a common faith can we ever reach unity, and by "faith" he seems to mean "faith in one's own conviction." He declares (on p. 74) that "living faith is not faith in a fabric, whether of order or doctrine," and (on p. 77) that the unity of the Church "rests upon moral and personal conversion, real, but not standardized. It rests on a new birth; and on baptismal regeneration not at all." The same repudiation of regeneration by sacrament appears on pp. 110, 111, when Dr. Simpson explains that Baptism is an act of our Lord through His Church, assuring fathers and mothers that their children are (from their birth) truly children of God. "It is not regeneration, it is Gospel."

As regards "Episcopacy," Dr. Simpson could accept it as a fact of a united Church, but not as a fact to be treated

as necessary. "Exclusive Episcopacy," he says (p. 116, n. 2), "means cutting ourselves off from Christian brethren all over the world; and to accept or even acquiesce in it would be not only a treachery to them, but an act of treason against unity itself." . . . "The first, and the absolutely essential step 'towards reunion' is recognition, and that not in word only, but in practice." To the same effect speaks Dr. Garvie (p. 159): "As regards re-ordination, it is not *amour propre* that forbids us as non-conformists entertaining the proposal even for a moment. The demand itself betrays for us so false a view of the constitution of the Christian Church and the relation of Christ to those whom He has called to the ministry of His Gospel, that we should be surrendering the truth as we hold it if we submitted." The special significance of this passage is in the fact that it comes from one of the signers of a certain famous "*ad interim* Report," in which Anglicans and non-conformists agreed that the united Church of the future must have Episcopal government. Now it appears that some of the signers would demand that this Episcopally-governed Church should officially recognize ministries not of Episcopal ordaining. This is a great new light on the value of agreements entered into by people who do not agree.

But a graver matter is the suggestion which seems to peep from between these covers that the Church of England shall be reformed by disruption, driving the Catholic party out on one side, and bringing the non-conformist in on the other. Such an idea is expressly disclaimed by the Rev. A. J. Carlyle (Anglican) on p. 122—"it would be folly to attempt to heal one division in the Christian Church by measures which would at present inevitably produce another." But this very policy is urged by Dr. Vernon Bartlet on p. 197: "It is of vital moment that Evangelical Anglicans, and in fact all English Churchmen who

really accept the spirit and standpoint of those Articles of Religion which define* the position of their National Church as one among the Churches should definitely break with all modes of thought and following touching non-conformist Communion due to traditional 'Catholic' language and principles." Here is a challenge from a Congregationalist. In a paper on "Intercommunion" an Anglican writer, Canon Burroughs,—his delightful book, *The Way of Peace*, is the Bishop of London's latest Lent-reading recommendation—gives the challenge a sympathetic reply. He is sure that any religion which produces good people is blessed and recognized by our Lord, and that everything which calls itself a church has a valid Eucharist, and that the time has come for our Church to say so. "The principle of spiritual hospitality should be officially recognized" (p. 254). Nay, he cannot wait for the Church to wake up to this duty. He calls on Churchmen of his own type to force the issue. God's plan depends on "our daring and determination (p. 238). He quotes a young officer writing from France (p. 262): "I think sympathetic revolutionaries are wanted, and that it is the duty of people who care much for their Church, but more for Christianity undifferentiated, to precipitate suitable crises." One might remark that "Christianity undifferentiated" would seem to be the equivalent of "Christianity unrecognizable," and that such, if it exists, is not worth caring about. But Canon Burroughs cares intensely, and he calls on his friends to "precipitate crises" of indiscriminate intercommunion between Church and Sect. That it is possible for some of our brethren and fathers to "precipitate crises" in this way, we sorrowfully acknowledge.

*We must here enter a protest. The 39 Articles were very carefully drawn so as to give as little offense as possible to members of two opposite parties and so were made most curiously ambiguous and indefinite. To speak of them as *defining* the position of the Church of England is curiously to misread a most critical passage in history.

We write it down very solemnly that that is not a movement "towards Reunion."

(7) "Report of Lambeth Conference, 1920." We have already expressed our mind concerning the action of the Bishops at Lambeth. They had to deal with the cruel facts of a divided Christendom, and having got what they believed to be a true vision of the facts, they tried, with prayer and self-discipline, to learn how to meet those facts in the highest and finest way. Here were men of great moral earnestness, and of the greatest diversity of natural views, who diligently put themselves to school to God, and were led to a wonderful agreement. We hold that they missed the facts very seriously as to the real condition of the Protestant Churches, greatly *overrating* their hold on the Catholic Creeds, and *underrating* the strength of their convictions along anti-sacerdotal and anti-sacramental lines. But we venture to suggest that the Holy Spirit may have used this misapprehension of theirs, instead of removing it, in order to guide them into giving a truly splendid example of Christian charity and humility. They made it clear that in asking Protestants to submit to conditional ordination they were asking for no sacrifice which they would not be ready to make, themselves. We wish clearly to be understood as taking our place among those priests who, if it would seriously help forward the Reunion of Christendom, would be willing to receive from Greek or Roman sources conditional ordination as priests. S. Chad of Lichfield, in the seventh century, was never more truly a saint than when he, knowing himself to be a Catholic bishop, knelt before Theodore of Tarsus to receive from that high-handed reformer a fresh Episcopal consecration. We do not see why the same thing might not be asked of any Christians. Humble yourselves to receive the authority of the Lord Jesus for your ministration from any who think that they can give you lacking

authority, if on the strength of that imagined supply they can receive you in love. And we need not ask such brethren to *think* that they lacked anything, even as our consciences would not allow us to acknowledge any lack in our own case. The Lambeth Report is a very noble example of how a certain sort of situation ought to be dealt with. We simply say that we do not think that such a situation exists.

(8) But whether we are right or wrong in that opinion, we wish to commend to our readers the book, "Lambeth and Reunion," in which three English Bishops, those of Peterborough, Zanzibar and Hereford, representing Broad, High, and Low sympathies, respectively, agree in an interpretation of the Lambeth Resolutions and Appeals. It is a striking fact that these three bishops were able to cooperate so thoroughly that every line in the book appears as the utterance of all three. And it is a book which it is an inspiration to read.

(9) Yet after all it is our very foremost need to face the actual facts, and for clear vision (of the facts of other Communion than his own) and for constructive statesmanship we must give a very high place to the book of the Jesuit, Fr. Walker,—*"The Problem of Reunion."* It does not give in large detail the interesting facts of our American movements towards cooperation and union, as did our No. 4; but it is of all these volumes the most masterly in setting out the world's need for a united Church and the most statesmanlike in its handling of the constructive problem. Of course, he sees through Roman eyes. He is sure that Catholics are as much bound by the Vatican Creed as by the Nicene, that the Pope is an infallible guide, and that the Roman Church is the Catholic Church. We have to resist his assumptions at every turn. Also, we find his reading of history as impossible to accept as that of his namesake, Prof. Williston Walker. But we find

nothing to resent. He is strong and wise and kind. We note one historical slip, which needs correcting: on pp. 64, 65. Fr. Walker declares that the Episcopal Church of Scotland derives its Episcopal succession from consecrations of Presbyterian ministers to be bishops in 1610, and that the Church of England at that time officially recognized the ministry of these Presbyterian divines, who had had only presbyterial ordination. Fr. Walker is wrong in both statements. (a) The Scottish Episcopate of 1610 died out in four years, leaving no succession at all. The present Scottish Episcopate derives from English consecrations in 1662. On that occasion two of the candidates had had Episcopal ordination to the priesthood, the other two were required to receive such ordination before their consecration as bishops. And, furthermore, (b), the act of 1610 involved *no recognition of the former ordination* of the candidates, but was expressly founded on Catholic precedents—there is an abundance of such—for making men bishops *per saltum*, without any previous ordination as deacons or priests. (Archbishop Bancroft gave a *personal opinion* that their Presbyterian ordination was valid. Archbishops of Canterbury are not held to be infallible, and the other consecrators agreed to proceed *only on the other ground*). The Church of England has never recognized even Presbyterian ordination.

But this is a very small slip for Fr. Walker to fall into. In general he is accurate and fair as to particular facts. We think that in his *survey* of facts he makes two serious mistakes. He credits English nonconformists with more orthodoxy than they really have (though certainly his quotations on pp. 34, 35 from the *Free Church Catechism* are very striking as showing what orthodox-sounding things these Churches have agreed to put forth as official teaching), and he insists on the “ambiguity” of Anglicanism in a way that must seem to us unfair. The fact that our

Church does tolerate a great deal of bad theology in non-essentials is not a proof that it is ambiguous as to what are essentials. As to what really are essentials, we have to differ from Fr. Walker, but we wish that many of our readers might read the opening essay of this book of his, on *The Need of Reunion*. We think that most who read those early pages will want to read on.

VIII.

Our criticism may seem to be sweepingly unhopeful and destructive. We wish to end with a truly constructive word. Difficult and unhopeful as the facts are which confront us, we have two things which we can do, and ought to do, to help our Lord to have His Will with His people.

(a) We have something in the way of brotherly fellowship which we can give to Christians with whom we cannot now unite. We need to cultivate personal friendships in two directions, with Roman Catholics, and with Protestants of every variety. We need to associate with them closely enough to understand the workings of their minds. We need to get near enough to them to feel the beating of their hearts. We need to feel in ourselves, and to make *them* feel, that there is a great oneness which binds together all men who care supremely for God and good. For most of us our present contribution to the cause of Church Unity is to fill ourselves with the spirit of brotherhood, and find brothers from whom we are now separated, on whom to pour out that spirit of brotherhood, and from whom to receive it as a gift of grace and power.

(b) And then we can all pray. We ought *everyone* of us to be doing it. We have spoken of the duty of "facing facts." Most of us have not begun to face this fact as we ought. We have felt that we could do nothing just now that was really "constructive." But we *have* something. Prayer is the greatest constructive force in the universe.

We all pray "Thy Kingdom come," and every day, and "Thy will be done," and those are both prayers for the Reunion of the members of Christ's Body on earth. Let us give up the time of our minds, and do more. What a power it would be, if all Catholics should make it a rule to say as one of their daily prayers the Collect of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom; as it is now adopted into our own Prayer Book:

O Lord Jesus Christ, who saidst unto thine Apostles, Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you; Regard not our sins, but the faith of thy Church, and grant unto it that peace and unity which is according to Thy will; who livest and reigneth with the Father and the Holy Ghost, one God world without end.

Let us pray!

The Fallacies of Dr. Frank Crane

REV. GEORGE CRAIG STEWART, D.D., L.H.D.

DR. Frank Crane likes to tell this story on himself:—
“A man,” he says, “once stopped me on the street and said with enthusiasm, ‘Crane, I read nearly all your stuff,—these little daily messages you publish in the newspapers.’ ‘Do you,’ I answered, ‘and how do you like them?’ ‘Well,’ he replied, ‘they remind me of the cigars my father used to smoke. Farinos they were called, as I remember it; they were awfully cheap, but once in a while you hit a good one.’ ” And the Doctor chuckles appreciatively as he tells the story.

The Century in its August number presented an article by Dr. Crane entitled “The Four Immoralities of the Church.” I should hesitate to appraise it as either “Colorado” or “Colorado maduro.” “It is not an attack upon the Church.” At least the author assures us it is not in his opening sentence. He is simply, as it were, an angel on some high place of Broadway opening the seals and revealing to a horror stricken world these new four horsemen of his very latest apocalypse. Here are the immoralities: *exclusiveness*, *respectability*, *cheapness* and *aggressiveness*. The Church is condemned—

First for being an organization at all, for recognizing a non-membership, for having boundaries, for seeking or claiming to embody Christianity in any definite social form;

Second for being respectable, a serious charge indeed in these days of emancipation from traditional ethical tabus;

Third for being inexpensive. (The author holds a strange economic theory that twenty-five cents admission to the church for each worshipper would remove this

stigma and crowd the churches, at present, I suppose, assumed to be empty) ;

Fourth for consciously seeking to improve personal morals and social conduct instead of just sitting around and "loafing" as Jesus did (not of course according to the Evangelists, but according to Dr. Crane).

These are the heinous crimes charged against the Church. Let us consider these so-called immoralities one by one.

1. The charge of exclusiveness.

"Christianity," says the critic, "is essentially unorganizable." To organize it is "to change a living spirit into a dead steam-roller." "The whole organization idea of the Church," he goes on, "is antiquated; it fits the time when men believed in a world-carpentry of seven days, each twenty-four hours long, and evolution was denounced as a heresy." To all of which I reply, this is what might be called the *scientific* fallacy of one who has apparently failed to grasp the meaning of the creative method called evolution, which deals alone with the organization of life. An unorganized Christianity would be simply no Christianity at all, just as that lovely and luminous spirit known as Frank Crane would be helplessly inarticulate were it not mediated by a very intricate organism known as the body of Crane, including certain bundles of ganglia called brains, and a hand to hold his deft and eloquent pen. That all these physical embodiments of Crane are the product of long ages of evolution from paleolithic man, and even from *M. Pithecanthropus* himself, derogates not at all from the dignity and worth of that lively spirit which organizes and uses them. Now Christianity is thus embodied in the Church which, as St. Paul delights to say over and over again, is nothing less than the mystical body of Jesus Christ Himself. There is surely nothing absurd in such an embodiment of the highest and holiest life. It cannot

justly be called immoral. Is music essentially unorganizable? Is it unethical to catch an evasive spirit of melody and embody it in a song? Is beauty unorganizable? Are sculpture, painting, architecture criminal procedures? Is steam unorganizable, or light or sound, or patriotism or law? All of life is sacramental. Every spiritual reality in this world must be embodied to be available, transferable, effective. This then is Dr. Crane's first fallacy.

The second might be called the *historical* fallacy. Dr. Crane confuses "the *Church*" and "the Churches." The former is in his title alone; what he proceeds to attack are "the Churches" which "as we find them today," he says, "are organizations in the same category as political parties, lodges, clubs and orders." With such organizations this reply has nothing to do. They are not under discussion. The Church of the New Testament, the Church of all Christendom for at least a "chiliad" as Dr. Crane would say, the Church of two-thirds of Christendom today, in short the historic Holy Catholic Church was founded by Jesus Christ Himself. Doctor Crane denies this, but the words of Jesus Himself are quite explicite: "Upon this Rock I will build My Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it!" Bernard Shaw may remark that "He founded it upon a pun," but even Bernard Shaw must admit that He founded it. To say as Dr. Crane does that "the twelve apostles were no club but merely His chosen friends" is grossly—I had almost said immorally—untrue. According to the Gospel records Jesus did not do what Dr. Crane says he did, send the twelve out to preach a "gospel of contagious *friendship*." He spent at least three years training them in the principles of "the Kingdom of God," appointed them "to sit on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel," solemnly said, "Whose soever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained," and commissioned them to go into

all the world to disciple all nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. He bade them wait till the signal came and then to begin their propaganda. Judas fell, but they met and elected his successor at once,—(that looks like definite organization, doesn't it?)—and “when the day of Pentacost was fully come” they committed what to Dr. Crane is a gross immorality, by going out into the streets of Jerusalem to convert men by calling upon them to repent and be baptized, and that very day according to the record “three thousand souls” were by baptism initiated into the Body of Christ, that Church which St. Paul describes as the “fulness of Him that filleth all in all.”

If Christianity is corrupt because it is embodied in the Church, it was corrupted at its source and Dr. Crane is assailing not only the authors of the New Testament Epistles and Gospels but the divine founder of Christianity Himself.

Now there is a third fallacy in this first point and that I shall call the fallacy of the *provincial mind*. Dr. Crane may perhaps be pardoned for it on atavistic grounds. He was formerly a Methodist minister, and later a Congregational pastor, passing easily to and fro as a preacher from one Protestant denomination to another. That he eventually faded out of the active ministry of any of these bodies may be because he found them too narrow, too exclusive. But this is no argument against the historic Church which bears for its very title the most inclusive of all words—“Catholic.” One does not join that like a lodge for social reasons. One is born into it by baptism. It was so in the days of the Apostles. It is so today. And that baptism is in Christian countries a corollary of birth, a second birth as the Church calls it which follows upon the first with a certain inevitableness. Has the distinguished critic never visited Italy or Spain or Greece or

•

Russia or England? And does he not know that in these countries practically every human being is also in the Church? This may mean,—of course it does mean,—that there are plenty of immoral members of the Church, but it is most certainly an effective answer to the charge of exclusiveness. Dr. Crane has simply missed the mark. He has been guilty of egregious provincialism. He has set out to describe spots on the sun and has missed the sun entirely, falling into that peculiar lunacy which confuses the moon with the live and luminous body from which it draws its light. He has been saying "Church" and thinking "Churches"; saying "Church" and thinking of little American sects of which we believe there are some one hundred and sixty-four, each with its own credal shibboleth, while the Catholic Church fills the earth, *et securus judicat orbis terrarum*.

2. Which brings us to the second immorality,—respectability.

Dr. Crane once lived in Chicago. Did he ever attend Mass say in St. Stanislaus Church? (There are, I believe, over twenty thousand souls in this "exclusive" North Shore parish, and the church is filled five or six times for masses on a Sunday morning). Did that congregation offend him by its respectability? Did he feel as if he were at Palm Beach? Was the air heavy with the noxious fumes of Djerkiss and Azurea? Did he rise up in wrath and hurry through Little Hell shuddering over the respectability of the worshippers? Did he? Yet he maintains that ecclesiastical authority and immoral respectability go arm in arm. As a matter of easily ascertainable fact, the Church that is reaching the masses, the common people who heard Jesus so gladly, is exactly the Church which lays the greatest emphasis upon the note of ecclesiastical authority. Dr. Crane may have identified the Church with "bourgeois prosperity or suburban respectability";

he says he has done so, but when he does it is clear that his mind is obsessed by the memories of certain Protestant parishes where fashionable congregations were wont to assemble Sunday after Sunday to enjoy the costly and eloquent preachments of the Reverend Dr. Crane. As for the "thieves, gamblers, harlots and hoboos" whom he would so eagerly welcome into the Church,—he need not be anxious,—they are there in great numbers, furnishing a constant scandal to the ancient order of Pharisees who still draw their robes aside and go on their way sniffing about the lower classes and criminal classes who infest the Catholic Church.

You see it is a major premise of Protestantism that the Church is an association of holy people, of saints. You join it when you can guarantee that you have been soundly converted, that you have passed, as Prof. James says, from "a state of conscious spiritual inferiority to a state of conscious spiritual superiority." Respectability is a *sine qua non* of membership. But that is not the conception of the Catholic Church, as it most certainly was not that of Jesus. Wheat and tares grow together in her field. The net of the Kingdom gathers in good and bad, and the Church, like her compassionate Master, loves them all, ministers to them all, and, as Cardinal Newman once said, (though I do not remember his exact words) patiently gathers in a million souls, that she may by her teaching and prayers and discipline save a thousand; gathers in a thousand that perchance she may bring one safely home to God.

The Church as such is not merely worthy of respect, respectable,—it is worthy of deepest reverence because it is Jesus Christ still embodied, still incarnate moving among men. But it is the most democratic institution on earth in which there is "neither Greek nor Jew, barbarian nor Scythian, bond nor free," rich nor poor, high nor low, but all

are one by virtue of their membership in the Body of which their divine Lord is the Head.

3. The third immorality cited by Dr. Crane is that the Church is free. He blows both hot and cold at this point. "The Church," he says, "has always been greedy for money." And later, "The Church would be on a sounder basis ethically if it sold its services like an honest merchant and did not claim to be offering it to people for nothing." Well, here are contradictory charges. The Church is too greedy; the Church is too generous. You take your choice apparently but at any rate the Church is immoral; that is the point and remember that any stick is good enough wherewith to thwack the Church. But this is not surprising when one remembers the words of our Lord,—"John Baptist came neither eating bread nor drinking wine and ye say he hath a devil. The Son of Man is come eating and drinking and ye say, behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners."

But Dr. Crane complains that the Church is immorally cheap. To be sure most of the preaching he says is cheap too (what a pity so many of our best preachers leave the ministry and take up journalism!), but it would respond to the stimulus of a better wage for the preacher if only we could once get the Church on a sound economic basis of say twenty-five cents an entrance. Twenty-five cents! Is that the Doctor's valuation of religion? We shudder to contemplate the wholesale bankruptcy of the Church if such a plan were adopted. The curse of the Church in this generation is just such immoral penuriousness as the twenty-five cents a person a week plan for spreading the Kingdom of God. What did Jesus charge for his services? Should He have charged twenty-five cents or its equivalent in denarii for each admission to the Sermon on the Mount? The answer is clear. "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister."

Men needed His message, His companionship, as men need bread or music or art, but He never capitalized that need to His own pecuniary gain. Was that immoral on His part? Then why fault His Church because like her Master she rises above the *quid pro quo* of commerce, finds it more blessed to give than to receive, rates among the deepest sins in her category the sin of simony, of traffick-ing in spiritual things, and cherishes the memory of that visit of the Master to the Temple when He overturned the tables of the traffickers, of those who carried on a brisk trade in the materials of sacrifice, crying out, "My Father's house shall be called a house of prayer but ye have made it a den of thieves."

We want no twenty-five cents a plate Christianity. What Jesus does demand is all that a man hath. The costliest thing in the world is Christianity, because it demands all. As someone has wisely remarked, "It doesn't take much of a man to make a Christian, but it takes all there is of him." And the hospitals builded by the Church, its orphanages and asylums, its homes for the aged and the infirm and the incurable, its schools, its colleges, its universities, all witness to the dedicated offerings of rich and poor alike who have heard their Master through His Church calling out, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these ye have done it unto Me!" In the face of what the Church has always done and is doing today in mitigating the horrors of the world's imperfect economic system, the statement of Dr. Crane that "forty millions of dollars poured into the coffers of the Church tomorrow would not advance the cause of Christ one inch" sounds strangely empty, windy and unreal.

4. The fourth immorality is this,—“that the Church aggressively proposes to do people good.” This is defined as spiritual snobbery. Yet I do not recognize it as snobbery when my mother who, by the bye is also guilty of re-

spectability and of a certain generosity and who is also exclusively *my* mother, seeks to do me good,—consciously seeks it, and sometimes most aggressively. Once more Dr. Crane is limited by his own experience and obsessed with sectarian methods. We infer that he disapproves of professional revivals. So do we. We infer that he dislikes the ranting evangelist. So do we. But once more, what has that got to do with the militant purpose of the Church? One may dislike the band without denying that a war is on and the troops are going into battle.

According to Dr. Crane Jesus Christ did not work. He says "Jesus loafed; just wandered around and talked to anybody that would listen." "He never," says this extraordinary writer, "tried to do anybody good, that is His conscious effort was not to improve the morals of anyone. He was forever talking about joy, not virtue, etc., etc." This is misrepresentation carried to the Nth power, and it is perilously near blasphemy.

"My Father worketh hitherto and I work," says Jesus—Work! "Work broad as the earth has its summit in heaven. There is sweat of the brow, and up from that to sweat of the brain, and up from that to sweat of the heart! This includes all Kepler calculations, all Newton meditations, all spoken epics, all acted heroisms up to that *agony of sweat in the Garden that all men call divine!*" Surely Dr. Crane has not forgotten his Carlyle. Was there ever such a worker as Jesus Christ? His days spent in ministering to the sick,—*"and He healed them every one,"*—were punctured by nights spent in prayer upon the mountains. No journey was too difficult for him to take, no demand upon body and mind too great, for *"I must work"* He said *"the works of Him that sent Me!"* From the carpenter shop in Nazareth to the hard climb up the hill with the cross on His back He was working, working to accomplish his mission, and when He died it was a sigh of

thankful if wearied satisfaction. "It is finished!" "I have finished the work Thou gavest Me to do!"

Joy was indeed often on His lips as it was ever in His abounding consciousness of oneness with the Father, but joy without virtue was to Jesus unthinkable. Dr. Crane quotes the Sermon on the Mount, but only a portion of it. Was Jesus not "trying to improve the morals of anyone" when in that same series of addresses He said, "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven?" And what do passages like the following mean—also taken from the Sermon on the Mount? "Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause is in danger of the judgment;" and "Whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart, and if thy right eye offend thee pluck it out and cast it from thee for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell." But why continue quotations? Dr. Crane says "He never made an effort to improve the morals of anyone." Dr. Crane says "He would not argue with the Pharisees." Dr. Crane says "He was forever talking about joy, not virtue." That these statements are simply not so may be proved by any person capable of reading who will take the trouble to open any one of the Gospel narratives and see for himself.

The Church is not dedicated to a program of "loafing, of just wandering around talking to everybody that will listen." That delectable vocation is reserved for ex-preachers who can afford it. The Church was organized to bring to all the world the knowledge of Jesus Christ, to establish personal contacts with Him, to convey His grace for clean and joyful living and to make the principles of His Kingdom effective in social relationships. It is a great mission thus to make Jesus contemporaneous with every age. Her

title is clear, her credentials are divinely given, and for program she is content to take that of her divine Lord Who opened His ministry by reading from the prophet "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me because He hath anointed Me to preach the Gospel to the poor: He hath sent Me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord." "This day," said He, "is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

And every day still it is being fulfilled as the Church pursues her mission.

The spiritual snob, the Puritanical prig, the pious cheap skate, the professional up-lifter, we despise as heartily as Dr. Crane. These are the criminals he is seeking to convict. They are inside the Church, but the Church has no monopoly on them. They are recognizable types discoverable in any group. They no more justify charges of immorality against the Church than they justify wholesale charges of immorality against the race.

The Church needs to be warned against immoralities, but these we have been considering are not among the first four or the first four hundred. Dullness of vision, feebleness of faith, lukewarmness of zeal, limpness of loyalty to Jesus Christ, these are the four real immoralities of Christian discipleship, from all of which, the Church prays

Good Lord, deliver us!

The Practical Significance of The Devotional Life

LAIRD WINGATE SNELL

ALL prayer presupposes an intelligence above and beyond us to which our prayers can be directed. The Christian faith goes farther and says that not only is there an intelligence above to which prayer may be directed, but a loving Father round about us in Whom we live and move and have our being. The practice of the devotional life reveals the astonishing significance of this faith. It makes plain the fact that our Father God is an all-encompassing spiritual environment of surpassing wisdom and love; that each human soul, if it will, can attain to a state of profound harmony and responsiveness towards this divine environment; and that by virtue of this adaptation of the soul to its spiritual environment infinite wisdom and love order and shape the whole progress and development of the individual life down to its least details. The consistent carrying out of the devotional life makes this ordering and leading on the part of overshadowing love a matter of knowledge—a matter beyond possibility of doubt. Repeatedly, unfailingly, insistently, the unforeseen developments of the days, the months, the years, reveal a plan, a purpose, an ordered working towards a definite goal, that are wholly beyond one's own making or choosing—too lofty, too holy, too divine, to be possibly of one's own making or choosing; so lofty and holy and divine that they can be perceived in detail and their meaning understood only little by little, step by step, as one yields oneself increasingly to the Father's purpose and is led progressively towards the Father's goal.

In addition to the assiduous practice of prayer and devotion, two principles must characterize the life that would enter into this wonderfully complete correspondence with the divine: the first, the soul's identification of itself with the divine purpose; the second, faith that gives God time and opportunity to shape His plan out of the disorder one has wrought in the fabric of life. For in case of most of us, weakness and self-will work confusion in life's pattern before we are ready to commit it to our Father; and the first work of the Father's love must be that of disentanglement and the initiation of that order that will with time discover a pattern in life of divinest beauty and worth. This period of disentanglement and first steps is a time of great darkness for the soul, of severest testing of faith. Under the impulsion of some deep insight, some keener sense of moral neediness or clearer call of the ideal, one has taken the step that dethrones self-will and commits life utterly to God. It was an act of moral and spiritual exaltation—charged with hope and promise; an act of largest confidence and faith. What follows seems a betrayal of that confidence, a disillusionment of that hope. Life is turned topsy-turvy; one after another hoped-for developments that would seem to justify the great act of faith turn but to ashes and bitterness; door after promising door is closed in one's face; all appears a mockery—this belief in a detailed leading and shaping of life; one must take hold once more with one's own hands, have one's own self-formed plan, and shape events and developments as one may to one's own ends. This, however, is the inconstant faith that denies God time and opportunity to work His order out of our confusion, to arrange our tangle on the lines of His pattern, to close the doors to which our short-sightedness and self-will have brought us till He can lead us to His own door of largest opportunity and blessed fulfilment. A constant

faith, then, through whatever of darkness and perplexity may descend upon the soul, is a condition of one's entering upon the life planned and ordered from above.

The force of the first condition—that one must identify oneself with God's purpose in order to enter upon that life—is self-evident. That purpose is the bringing of the kingdom. Life must be service, devoted to Christ's cause, held in trust for the large ends of the kingdom of God, if it is to enter into that harmony with the divine that correlates its minute details with a heaven-formed plan. Precisely this is the teaching of Jesus in His words, "Seek ye first His kingdom and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you." The puerility and shallowness of the thinking of this age is well instanced by the oft-uttered belief that Jesus, in this and similar teachings as to the divine care and providence, spoke for His own day only, when life was simple and human necessities not bound up with the vast complexities of our advanced civilization. As though infinite wisdom and love and the all-inclusive laws of God might be adequate to one phase of mundane development but not to another!

Given the adoption of God's goal of the kingdom as the goal and reason of one's own being, given the constancy of faith that, after committing the life to God will leave it in His hands to shape and fulfil, then prayer and devotional practice remain as the supreme means given us for ordering life entire after the thought of God. Here lies the practical significance of the devotional life—it is *the* human agency for realizing in human life in all its breadth and depth and ramifying relationships the perfect, detailed plan of infinite wisdom and infinite love; it is the pre-eminent means entrusted to men for fulfilling the petition: Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. And when God's will is done on earth as it is in heaven, each and every human life will be complete in Him, ful-

filled in love and truth and goodness, and the kingdom will have come.

It is evident that if the eternal purpose of God be made the purpose of one's life, then there is nothing practical for that life save the knowledge of God's will and strength to do it. Devotional practice brings that knowledge and supplies that strength. Any man in any honorable calling can and should correlate that calling to the services of the kingdom. Laborer, financier, home-maker, artist, public official, professional man, industrial captain, one and all are needed for the bringing of the kingdom, and should serve the kingdom with the abilities and opportunities that are theirs. For "there are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all." In these words are presented the ideal for human society: each individual ministering to the whole body in the performance of his special function, through God working in him to will and to do. And for every individual, whatever his work or calling, who would see his own life approaching this ideal and furthering this ideal for humankind, the one, big, practical thing is prayer and devotional practice. For the practical thing in furthering the ideal of the kingdom is to translate the thoughts of God into actualities. The thoughts of God so translated are the very frame work and substance of the kingdom. The man so translating the thoughts of God builds of "gold, silver, precious stones"; all other building is "wood, hay, stubble." And it is prayer and the devotional life that far beyond anything else place human beings *en rapport* with the thoughts of God. The very soul of prayer is the listening ear Godwards. Prayer is nothing other than a man's whole nature in the attitude of receptiveness, of humble teachableness, towards the

divine nature—the attitude that the Psalmist enjoins: “Hold thee still in the Lord, and abide patiently upon Him.” It is the child coming to its Father with its needs and longings and requests, indeed, but learning as its first lesson that the Father KNOWS and LOVES, and that the only sensible and genuine attitude of approach, accordingly, is that of wishing to learn the Father’s will and seeking strength to do it. The devotional life is schooling one’s mind to perceive and know God’s will, and one’s nature to respond to that will spontaneously and completely. The soul’s response to His will can far outrun in fact the conscious perception of it. Through prayer God works in the deeps of one’s nature to make the issues of life flow naturally in the channels of His will, while oftentimes it is only after the event or series of events that one perceives he has been secretly led, inspired in the hidden deeps, to carry out a purpose of God. Even more surprising and blessed is the discovery that the devotional life is constantly leading others in the way of that Will and inspiring them through hidden channels to further the purposes of God. Next to attuning one’s own soul to the divine harmonies, the great office of prayer and devotion is the shaping of other souls to share in the one great symphony of bringing the kingdom of heaven upon earth through the knowing and doing of God’s will. Prayer is leaven—it spreads its unseen life from particle to particle; it opens secret doors in human hearts on every side to the vital energy that is the holy will of the living God; and, again, it does this in the deeps, where works the mind of God beneath and beyond the purpose and intention of praying mortals. Given the attitude of real prayer—waiting upon God’s will—the purpose and intention of him who prays are caught up by the mighty current of that perfect Will and made to subserve its ends,—ends always higher and better and often quite other than are in the

heart of him who prays.

Thus it appears that devotional practice is doubly practical: it progressively orders one's own life on the divine pattern, and opens numberless unseen doors to divine forces to enter other lives and do a like work there. Prayer is the supreme agency for bringing the kingdom of God both individually and socially. It furthers the doing of the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven both on the part of those who are given to prayer, and on the part of the various social groups of which they are members and in which their prayer-life is a silently, powerfully working factor. From the point of view of the eternal kingdom nothing is so practical as prayer; nothing is practical without prayer; nothing avails save through prayer; everything divorced from prayer is refuse destined to aeonian fires. To the end of God's will being done on earth as it is in heaven, all the endeavor and exertion and strenuosity of the age—including that directed towards remaking society, all the vaunted scientific efficiency of the hour—including efficiency in Church work, all the speeding up of multiplied human agencies towards piled up human goals, all are nothing and less than nothing and do but hinder God's will being done on earth as it is in heaven, unless they strike root in the soil of devotion, spread their branches in the atmosphere of prayer, and draw life and vital purpose from those divine relationships that are discovered and made dynamic by devotional practice. Nothing less than this is our Lord's own teaching: "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, so neither can ye except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me and I in him, the same beareth much fruit; for apart from me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered; and they gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned." This

also was what He aimed to teach Martha: "But one thing is needful; for Mary hath chosen the good part which shall not be taken from her." Mary's choice, the one thing needful, was to sit at Jesus' feet, to learn of Him, to abide in Him; having made sure of that, she could know that whatever activity followed spontaneously thereupon would be the certain, simple doing of God's will; activity marked by fundamental economy, activity applied immediately to the thing eternally worth doing, at the moment it would avail most in eternity—and done without haste and without waste either of physical, mental, or spiritual energy. That is the practical fruit of the devotional life: one's activities selected by a higher Wisdom; the futile, the superfluous, the impractical, whatever would have no enduring worth, whatever is not vitally related to the kingdom, eliminated; what God wills because it is worthy, because it is of the eternal, that is done, and done with a divine economy of time and thought and endeavor.

How wholly opposed is this to the misconception of the devotional life,—that it rules out all forms of activity but that of prayer,—which is responsible for the name "Quietism!" That is not the meaning of the devotional life, nor the teaching of the leaders of the "Quietists,"—extreme as their teaching seems to this material, rushing age. The truth is this: that no activity is worth while save as it is prayer-inspired and prayer-impelled, the spontaneous bursting forth of the divine life within—cultivated and cherished by much prayer—in fruition that fulfils God's will; just as the branch that abideth in the vine bursts forth with the inevitable fruit of the vine's full, flooding life.

The devotional life simply takes Christ at His word: "But one thing is needful." "He that abideth in me and I in him, the same beareth much fruit." The devotional life is "abiding in Christ,"—that and nothing more; it is

choosing "the one thing needful"—to wait at His feet and hear His word, till His word and His Spirit possess the whole being and find spontaneous expression through the whole being as a vine through its branches.

For the complete, rounded devotional life there is necessary a two-fold emphasis: secret prayer in the closet, and the fellowship of prayer in the Church; the soul's long, intense, concentrated endeavor and wrestling in the spirit alone through the night by the brook Jabbock—crying, "I will not let thee go except thou bless me;" and the quiet, deep, restful lifting up of heart and soul in that communion with God that is possible only through our fellowship one with another and with all saints in Him, that completer knowing and partaking of God that is *worship*,—the expression of the fundamentally and necessarily social character of the religious nature realized in the services, sacraments, and varied Church observances by Catholic Christianity. Each form of devotion is complementary to the other; the devotional life halts if either lacks. The gift which, if practiced in balanced union, they bring to the soul is the spirit of holiness. The mark of holiness is power. The pattern of holiness is Jesus Christ. Its law is instant responsiveness to the Father's will. Its fruit is the greater glory of Jesus Christ in bringing men to know Him more truly, love Him more deeply, and seek His likeness with all their hearts. The compelling power of holy lives is the world's great need. And as holiness and the power of holiness are the direct fruit of prayer and devotion, this means that the world's crying need is many, many followers of the Crucified given heart and mind and soul to devotional practice.

This call is to all Christians. The Christian layman will almost inevitably feel that by no possible ordering of his affairs could he give hours to private prayer, or practice due observance of worship and sacrament. Yet, honestly

faced, is this not saying that one hasn't time to seek first God's kingdom and righteousness, to fit one's calling into the service of that kingdom, to follow Christ in earnest till one's life actually counts for Him? One can appreciate the immense difficulties confronting the layman who would shape business or professional life to the devotional ideal; but those very difficulties would bring his endeavor the greater reward, and make his devotional activity the *more* wonderfully fruitful in holding up before men's eyes His crucified and risen Lord. The call for many, many laymen to live the life given to prayer and devotion and to manifest the power of the spirit of holiness in the world of present-day business and industry and of national and international politics is tremendous. Nothing else nor less will ever transfuse modern business and industry and state and world-wide politics with the Spirit of Jesus Christ; and only the transfusion of world industry and politics with the spirit of Jesus Christ will save civilization. Surely, never was greater motive for laymen to seek the heights and depths of Christian experience, and of the promises of Christ: "He that abideth in me and I in him, *the same beareth much fruit.* . . . Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit, *and so shall ye be my disciples.*"

But if the call to the laymen is insistent today, surely it sounds with ten-fold more insistence to the priests of the Church, the stewards of the mysteries of Christ. They are publicly committed to know nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified, to draw all their cares and studies this way; their avowed pattern of life and conduct is His own holiness; utmost endeavor, hours unnumbered, given to prayer and devotional practices, serve directly to fulfil their daily duty,—part of the recognized demands of their calling.

In numberless special ways prayer is the one practical

activity of the minister of Christ. The devotional life fully carried out does away with those limitations—physical, moral, spiritual—that rob the priest of power in the service of Christ and of human souls. It enables him then to work within his essential limitations with a God-given economy and effectiveness, giving him to know how literally, amazingly true was St. Paul's experience—Christ's strength made perfect in his servant's weakness. It saves him from the blight of the spirit of the age—the drive, the pressure, the machine-method, the madness for out-put—that kills all spiritual planting at its roots. Amidst a generation going to pieces by reason of the confused vagaries of an age of shallow, make-believe thinking, that with a chance epigram cavalierly disposes of the profoundest problems of existence, the devotional life makes the priest a thinker,—he has to think and think deeply to follow the life of prayer. He has to live deeply also, deeply and truly, while the prayer-life reveals to him, hidden in his own breast, God and human nature—the two essentials of knowledge for him who as pastor and preacher would minister the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The devotional life entire is *education in the REAL*—indispensable for power in the work and message of a priest. It gives him, moreover, the repose, the poise, the confidence, the decision, the leisure for the unforeseen demand, the calmness in the face of the sudden or terrible, that make him true shepherd of Christ's sheep, to whom they intuitively turn for strength and refuge in distress. Above all it makes him able, by a kind of divine instinct, to fit into spiritual situations—the most complex and hidden of human combinations—as the vital, the decisive factor. Bergson's account of animal instinct in its highest forms parallels exactly the way the man of prayer carries out the will of God in situations that lie beyond his power to understand, but where God would use him as His instrument. The prayer-life gives

the power of immediate penetration into the spiritual complex confronting one; one, oftentimes unwittingly, speaks the word or does the deed that strikes like the flaming sword of the truth of God home to the hearts of those concerned. In this and other quite unconscious ways the soul given to the devotional life radiates unseen spiritual energy. God ceaselessly, wonderfully uses him to further the doing of His will on earth as it is done in heaven.

Surely nothing so truly fulfils the calling of the priest as this spiritual penetration and power; surely nothing less than this is the priest's high calling. Yet we have to acknowledge that rarely does this seem to be the priest's ideal or consistent aim. To be "a man among men," to be an efficient administrator of a great parochial organization, to be distinguished, to pass as a gentleman of the world, to draw the crowds by popular oratory, these we recognize as not uncommonly the ideals of the clergy. There is but one true ideal: that Christianlike holiness of soul, rooted in utter humility of mind and heart, from which springs, spontaneous and constant, "demonstration of the Spirit and of power."

In the response by the great body of priests to this ideal and call lies the hope of the Church and the world. For what the priest by the fulness of the devotional life can be to his flock, that the Church can and should be to human society by the devotional life lived within its fold. The vast developments in human society, on the threshold of which even now we stand, but the nature of which we can by no means foresee, can be informed and led on to a true consummation only by divine forces working deep in the life of humanity. The Church is here as the custodian of those vital, God-sent forces, their only possible vehicle and channel,—the Church which is the Body of Christ, the projection of His Incarnation, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all. All our elaboration of organization, all our

preaching, all our modern-day insistence upon the "social gospel" are nothing worth, are without power to shape and inform the coming changes in human society, save as the channels are opened for the influx into the Church, and through the Church into the distressed, warring elements of human society, of the mighty, transforming, up-building vital energies of the Holy Spirit of God,—“Lord, and Giver of Life.” And these channels will be opened wide as throughout the Body of Christ everywhere are faithful members given with all that in them is to the life of prayer and devotion; and the Church, led by a body of clergy who are praying men of God, becomes a praying Church. The very nature and function of prayer, its essential reason for being, are its power to open up, cleanse from obstructions, and maintain in service those channels whereby the power of God is mighty among men. *The power is God's. Ours is the fulfilling of the conditions of power.* These conditions are fulfilled by the devotional life with its fruits in holiness and love.

One essential to the end of a priesthood endued with power is that our seminaries should emphasize and enforce the practice of the devotional life on the part of those preparing for Holy Orders far beyond anything that has been in the past. Scholarship has been one ideal for the ministry—however infrequently attained in our own country. Conversance with social problems and with methods of social endeavor has been put forward of late as more properly the aim of theological training. To these ends a city environment and proximity to some university center have been accounted needful for our seminaries. Such ends and means are in no wise to be despised. But in point of fact they have obscured the true ideal and obstructed the path thereto: spiritual power for our priests, through lives given to prayer, in the resolute following and intimate fellowship of Jesus Christ. Let the require-

ments of this ideal be put first; then let "all these things"—essential, indeed, as they are—that supplement and complete equipment for largest service of the Church and the kingdom be given due place and proportion in subordination thereto.

There is a group of Church people who hope to see the Racine College grounds and equipment taken over and used by the Church as a sort of Graduate School of theology and Christian practice, to which students and workers from over the country might come for varying periods of intensive study. If, in such a place, prayer and devotion were literally *made first*, creating an atmosphere of the Holy Presence and of spiritual power in which all the studies by Church people from every region should be carried on, and with continuous organized retreats, not only for clergymen and lay-workers, but for all kinds and classes of people, it could become a veritable dynamic center of power throughout the Church, a mighty means to holy living among clergy and laity, a "city at unity in itself whither the tribes go up"—for vision, for inspiration, for completing personal contact with the divine, for drinking deep of the living waters of refreshment; a source of profoundly quickened lives which would spread far the *conviction of spiritual realities* that only holy lives, and that "demonstration of the Spirit and of power" which holy lives give, ever bring to the souls of men encrusted with material concerns, the cares of this world, and the love of money. In particular, such a spiritual center for our Communion could release and make vital divine forces throughout the Church that would inspire and guide her to the fulfilment of her great mission so immediately urgent: showing Protestant Christendom the way to Catholic Church unity—the only unity that could ever come, or, coming, would be found worth while.

The call to attend the practice of the devotional life

comes first to those who already have made the great surrender in obedience to the heavenly vision, and are given to unceasing prayer that the vision may be fulfilled. These are the leaves already hid in the meal. Let them know that lives of prayer given to the pursuit of holiness are by divine law procreative; inevitably that vital impulse spreads like leaven from life to individual life. Let these be confident in faith, instant in prayer, constant in exalting all that makes up the devotional life, most humble in spirit, unfailing in Christ-like love; and above all, let them wait steadfastly upon the Lord of the harvest that He send forth laborers, clad in the garments of holiness, endued with power, baptized in the Holy Ghost, true ambassadors of Christ, reflecting as a mirror the image of their Lord, by whose lives the Crucified is lifted up till He shall draw all men unto Him.

William White

A Sketch from His Memoirs

JULIA C. EMERY

IF any Churchman of these days ever reads "The Life of George Washington" by Jared Sparks, he must be struck a hundred times by the similarities between the development of the nation's life and that of the Protestant Episcopal Church within the United States.

He may be inclined to refer this obvious connection to the fact that so many of the foremost Americans of those changing times were Churchmen, or to find it in General Washington's constant attendance upon the services of the Church. It is true that a pew in Christ Church, Philadelphia, was assigned him, which he and his wife and secretaries regularly occupied, and that Madam Washington was a faithful communicant there; but this alone could

never have greatly influenced those results which are so largely due to the lifelong labors of his friend and rector, William White.

It is difficult to imagine Bishop White as young. The most familiar likenesses picture him either as the reverend prelate in his episcopal robes, with white flowing hair and mild and serious countenance, or, silhouetted, in quakerlike garb, with long coat, tall hat and cane, as he passed daily on Philadelphia streets, going his unfailing rounds of duty and beneficence.

And perhaps there have been few instances where the child was more truly "the father of the man." The two childish incidents that come down to us are most illustrative of his future life and character. When he tied an apron around his neck and from behind a chair exhorted the little girl seated on the bench before him "to be good," and when he refused to go to dancing school because it was not "good for him" though others might like it; there were shown the early and unchanging leaning towards the ministry, and the decision concerning his own actions and the toleration concerning those of others, which marked his entire career.

He was born in Philadelphia on March 24, 1747 (Old Style), April 4, 1748 (New Style), and baptized in Christ Church on the 25th of May. His father, Thomas White, came to Maryland from England at sixteen years of age, and at forty-two removed, a widower, to Philadelphia, where he married Esther Hewlings, widow of John Newman, of Burlington, N. J. To this couple were born two children, a son, William, and a daughter, Mary, who married Robert Morris, member of Congress under the Confederation, and of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, the celebrated financier of the Colonies throughout the Revolution, and afterwards Senator in Congress. This family connection goes far to explain the peculiar advantages and

opportunities enjoyed by Bishop White in the formative days of State and Church.

His parents were both Episcopalians; his father a lawyer of "unsullied reputation" and "remarkably correct judgment," hospitable and social, and numbering among his friends the "principal gentlemen of the city"; his mother, of "excellent understanding and sincere and unostentatious piety." William divided his childhood and youth between his comfortable and happy home and his school life, passing from a "mistress school" at seven to the English school of the College of Philadelphia, of which his father was a trustee, and thence, at ten, to the Latin School of the College, entering college at fourteen and remaining until his graduation three years later. Throughout the ten years of his college life, Dr. William Smith was provost, with whom he was to be associated so closely and for so long in college and Church affairs.

Such a boy as he could never have been careless as to religious matters, but at the age of fifteen, the death of a young girl friend deepened his earnestness. George Whitefield visited Philadelphia about that time, and again, in Burlington in 1770, young White met him. His wonderful eloquence charmed the youth, but could not draw him from his sobered, accustomed religious practice. After the second interview he was decided that conversions through revivals were far less numerous than those through the ordinary, quiet efforts by which his own religious life had been guided and controlled.

While still at college, he and four other students who were looking forward to the ministry met under Dr. Smith on Sunday evenings for a few months in three successive years, and before large audiences delivered compositions on the history of the Bible, thus getting their introduction to public speaking. On leaving college, he began more definite preparation under Dr. Peters, his rector, and Mr.

Duché, assistant in Christ Church. Mr. Duché must have been a very interesting but erratic instructor. His views ranged from Jacob Boehme and William Law to John Calvin, and again to Swedenborg; but his level-headed young pupil could be drawn away by none of his vagaries.

In 1770 Mr. White went to England, where, on December 23, he was ordained Deacon by the Bishop of Norwich, in the Chapel Royal of St. James' Palace, Westminster, and, on April 25, 1772, was advanced to the Priesthood by the Bishop of London, in the Chapel of Fulham Palace.

The time intervening between these ordinations he spent chiefly in lodgings in London; but he had three aunts, his father's sisters, at Twickenham, and it is easy to imagine the pleasure they took in frequent visits from their American nephew, and their affection for him, which was shown later in a bequest of £3,000.

During this stay in London the young Deacon called on Samuel Johnson, who was "very civil" to his guest from the other side, but could not resist saying that had he been Prime Minister during the late controversy over the Stamp Act, he would have sent a ship of war and levelled one of our chief cities to the ground. Commenting on this afterwards, his mild and discriminating visitor remarked, that noticing other indications of "a feeling heart," he did not believe the great lexicographer would "by any means have carried out his threat."

His lodgings being near those of Oliver Goldsmith in Brick Court of the Temple, Mr. White called also upon the poet. They discussed "The Deserted Village" and its reference to the decay of the peasantry. The youthful American saw the opportunity for its author to issue a pamphlet upon the subject, and was sadly disconcerted in his views of poetic fervor when Goldsmith failed to welcome the proposition. "A good poem would bring him one hundred guineas; the pamphlet would bring him nothing; it

was not worth his while."

While in England, Mr. White also made a few trips about the country, visiting Liverpool and the Manchester coalpits, Chatsworth and Bath, and Oxford, where he saw Canon Moore, who, fifteen years later, was to consecrate him Bishop, and heard Dr. Lowth, then Bishop of Oxford, preach, and listened to such music as was then unknown in the Church at home.

On September 13, 1772, Mr. White arrived in Philadelphia. He and a former associate in college, Mr. Coombe, had already been elected to assist Dr. Peters in Christ Church and St. Peter's, and they soon entered on their duties. At this time Mr. White gave evidence of his always generous spirit, by declining to receive any part of a special provision made for the more adequate support of the new assistants, leaving the full benefit to his friend.

In February, 1773, he married Mary Harrison, daughter of a sea captain from Lancashire, then a merchant of Philadelphia, who had been alderman and mayor of the city, and was also warden and vestryman of Christ Church. The married life, thus begun, continued most happily for twenty-four years, and was kept in tender and faithful recollection by Bishop White for the nearly forty years longer which remained to him after his wife's death.

With his assistantship began a parish ministry which elevation to the Episcopate did not break, and which lasted for sixty-four years. Age and infirmity caused Dr. Peters to resign; sympathy with England led both Dr. Duché and Mr. Coombe to retire to that country, and from 1779, Mr. White was rector.

And what a rectorate it was, of tender faithfulness on the one side and respectful devotion on the other! His sermons, carefully thought out and delivered with great rapidity, appealed to the understanding and affections, though they failed of that spell of inspiration which fires

the soul. But his daily life preached for him. In 1793, when yellow fever broke out in Philadelphia, he sent his family into the country, and stayed with two servants at home. His coachman sickened and died in the house, but his master went on his steadfast way, visiting the sick and performing every religious duty, serene and unperturbed among the most painful and revolting scenes. In several succeeding years of a like public distress he repeated these same ministries, and in 1832, at the age of eighty-four, when Asiatic cholera broke out in the city, again he was to be found in the cholera hospital by the bedside of the dying.

His income from his parish was \$2,200 or \$2,300; his salary as Bishop the interest on \$11,000, which was then the amount of the Bishop's Fund. His private fortune, "respectable, not large," was diminished during the Revolution by \$26,000. At the time of his death comment was made in England upon a Bishop of such slender means. But the editor of a Philadelphia paper had a better comprehension, who wrote: "He enjoyed a revenue beyond a monarch's command, and his daily income was beyond human computation. If he went forth, age paid him the tribute of affectionate respect, and children rose up and called him blessed."

But it was as a young Priest of twenty-four that this long ministry began, and what troublous times for the country, and what dark and uncertain times for the Church! As the Revolution came on, Mr. White set himself to study English History and the principles of the English Constitution, and he then made his firm decision in behalf of the Colonies, a decision from which he never wavered. His own judgment would have been on the side of a continued submission, while constantly pressing rightful claims; but when war was once declared, he had no choice, he must side with the Colonies. But he would not

make the Ministry an instrument to the war, or preach in its behalf; and he and his fellow clergy prayed for the King Sunday after Sunday, even on that last before the Fourth of July, 1776. Shortly after that date, however, he took the oath of allegiance to the United States, the second person in the Commonwealth to do so. It was a perilous step, and one not hastily taken. "I know my danger," he said, "and that it is the greater on account of my being a clergyman of the Church of England. The cause is a just one, and I am persuaded I will be protected." Yet, in later years, when in an early convention of the Church, Dr. Smith, who had opposed the Declaration of Independence, proposed a special service for the Fourth of July, Bishop White opposed the resolution, as tending to keep up political feeling and party. Still, when the resolution passed, out of respect to the ruling of convention he kept the day, though he never heard of its being kept in more than two or three places outside of Philadelphia.

In 1777 the British army took possession of that city, and he removed his family to Maryland. Congress, assembled at Yorktown, sent for him to serve as chaplain. He went at once, and later served them all their remaining time in Philadelphia, till they removed to Washington in 1801. The prayers he used were always the same,—the Lord's Prayer and the Collects for Ash Wednesday, Peace, Grace, the President, Congress, All Conditions of Men, with the General Thanksgiving, the Prayer of St. Chrysostom and the Grace. He was not given to change. As his religious views remained the same through life, so he believed the repetition of these familiar words to be more strengthening and uplifting, than varied petitions to meet varying needs or to accord with the passing conditions of the passing days would have been.

On Mr. White's return to Philadelphia after its evacuation by the British, he found himself the only Church

clergyman in the entire State, and from this time he began his never ceasing efforts to build up, from the shattered fragments of the Church of Colonial days, the strong and lasting fabric of an American Church, independent of all political associations.

His first endeavor met with active opposition, which, perhaps, in drawing attention to his desires, made them, in the end, more readily fulfilled. In August, 1782, when the Church seemed near annihilation, and independence still remote, he issued a pamphlet "The Case of the Episcopal Church considered"—advocating a Church free from the spiritual jurisdiction of any foreign authority; everything of party lines or civil nature to be avoided; a government by both clergy and laity; election to the highest office in the Church by clergy and laity together; and, pending the consecration of Bishops, permanent superintendents with like powers. This last project, Mr. White asserted, had been approved by Archbishop Tillotson and Bishops Patrick and Stillingfleet at the time of the Revolution of 1688, and actually practised in Ireland by Archbishop Bramhall. Dr. White also advocated smaller dioceses grouped into districts, whose legislative assemblies should be superior to those of the dioceses but inferior to a general convention of the whole body.

But with the speedy declaration of peace, in January, 1783, he turned from these considerations, and, with a few remaining clergy of the Episcopal Church, set himself to the task of effecting her revival and organization, and securing for her Episcopal succession. He reviewed the advantages the Church possessed in her religious freedom, in her exemption from Canon or Ecclesiastical Law, in her hold upon the ancient Liturgy. He saw her disadvantages in her unpopularity because of her connection with the Church of England, and because of the Tory element among some of her clergy, and the bad repute of others,

also because of the diversity of opinion among her members, so that while the Eastern States felt that the work of establishing the Church must be begun by Bishops, South Carolina had declared that they would have no Bishops consecrated by foreign Bishops.

Among these varying circumstances and opinions Dr. White stood calm and watchful. He had made a careful study of the principles of government, civil and ecclesiastical, of ecclesiastical law in England, and of the usages of the primitive Church. He was in the midst of the struggle which was slowly developing a nation out of scattered and diverse States. As the Nation was doing, the Church should do, and he wondered that any "sensible and well informed persons" should not see the "propriety" of conforming in some measure to the sentiments and habits of the people of the country which had just become "an independent, combined commonwealth." And the Church was already there, a body established by the Church of England, not to be newly founded by American Bishops consecrated on English soil. This was his contention, urging him to the confidence, which events justified, that the English Bishops would heed the appeal of a body of united Churchmen throughout the country, more readily than that which might come from one isolated State.

So, firmly persuaded that no union would ever be formed and no constitution adopted without the joint action of clergy and laity, while, on March 25, 1783, ten clergymen of Connecticut had elected Dr. Seabury and sent him across the seas for consecration, Dr. White consulted first his own vestries, then members from other congregations and on May 24, 1784, held the first State Convention of a body so constituted, to prepare for the meeting in New York, which was held in October of that year preliminary to the first General Convention of the Church, in September, 1785.

It was he who negatived the suggestion which came through Mr. Adams, then minister for England, that Orders might be received through the Church of Denmark, and made it clear to that minister from the beginning that the Episcopal Church in America was to be free from any foreign State for her Orders or any other matter. It was he who secured the continued personal influence of Mr. Adams, who, himself a Massachusetts Congregationalist, long after wrote him, "There is no part in my life on which I look and reflect with more satisfaction than the part I took, bold, daring and hazardous as it was to myself and mine, in the introduction of Episcopacy into America." And it was Dr. White who was Chairman of the Committee that conducted the long and diplomatic correspondence which finally won from the English authorities their slow consent to the Consecration of American Bishops.

There could have been no thought of any other first Diocesan for Pennsylvania. The Rev. Samuel Provost was elected for New York, the Rev. David Griffiths for Virginia. Mr. Griffiths found himself unable to make the voyage, but Dr. White and Dr. Provost sailed for England, where Mr. Adams welcomed them and showed them every attention in his power. Dr. White carried with him a certificate from the Supreme Executive Council of Pennsylvania, allowing him to take such means as he might think fit for "keeping up a succession of religious teachers, so long as these means induced no subjection to any foreign jurisdiction, civil or ecclesiastic."

On February 4, 1787, they were consecrated in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace. One Chaplain of the Archbishop read the service, another preached the sermon. Dr. White's old friend and tutor, Dr. Duché, was among the small congregation, who were chiefly from the Archbishop's household. Bishop White's unfailing thoughtful-

ness saw that "the fees for civil business to the Archbishop's court and household," which the Archbishop intended himself defraying, and which amounted to fourteen pounds, three shillings, one penny, were duly met.

The Bishops called upon the aged and dying Bishop Lowth, as representing the succession of Bishops of London who had fathered so remotely the feeble Colonial Church. He asked them about slavery in their new free country, and when Dr. White told him of the act just passed in Pennsylvania for its gradual abolishment, said with strong emphasis, "That is a very good measure." They visited other Bishops then in London, in acknowledgment of the consent they had given to their Consecration, and asked to be presented to the King, through whose civil authority such spiritual blessings were being granted. They need only bow to the King, the Archbishop told them, not bend the knee like the English Bishops in homage for their baronies.

On Easter Day, April 7, 1787, the Bishops landed in New York, and directly Bishop White was again at home.

From this time on, his life and that of the Church in this country flow together in a united, hardly distinguishable stream. In 1820, he published his "Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church," dedicated to her Bishops on every one of whom then living he had lain his hands in Consecration. The memoirs ran through the first thirty years of his episcopate, and a second edition carried them through the remaining twenty-two.

With a characteristic modesty, which increased with years, and ever prevented his dwelling upon himself or his part in the Church's life, he apologized for his prominence in these writings, as necessary, by reason of their being his personal observation, because he had more agency than any one else in what was recorded in them, and because he was enabled by his unfailing health and measure of

"worldly comforts" combined, to make such records. He might have added to these qualifications his careful and thorough habits of mind and action, which fitted him so admirably for the work. It was entirely characteristic of him that in ceasing to continue it, he gave as reasons, not only his advanced years, but his satisfaction that among the clergy there were those who were then preserving these records with equal care.

It was one of his latest acts to send a letter to the then Archbishop of Canterbury by the hand of Dr. Hawks, asking permission to search the documents bearing upon the earliest proceedings of the English Church in regard to her colonies.

"Being in the fiftieth year of the Episcopal succession received by me from the hands of one of the predecessors of your grace," he wrote, "I cannot be much longer efficient to raise our Church from the desolation almost amounting to annihilation in which it was left by the War of the Revolution. But it is in pursuit of the object to which my labors have been so long directed, that I solicit the condescension of your grace to the contents and the request of this letter."

"How old is the good Bishop now?" asked the Archbishop.

"In his eighty-ninth year," answered Dr. Hawks.

The Archbishop read the close of the letter again, aloud, "How beautifully he has expressed himself!" he exclaimed, "He is a venerable man."

"And I assure your grace," rejoined Dr. Hawks, "beloved as well as venerated by the Church in America."

On May 27, 1787, Bishop White had his first ordination, that of Joseph Clarkson whose grandson, Robert, was to be Bishop of Nebraska from 1865 to 1884. 1789, he drafted the Constitution for the Church, which he, as President, and all members of the General Convention signed.

In 1791, Dr. Coke, himself an ordained presbyter in the Church of England, presented that question whose solving has always been so desirable and so difficult. The Methodists had 60,000 adults in their Communion, with their families numbering 750,000—one-fifth of them blacks—from Boston to south of Georgia, from the Atlantic to Lake Champlain and Kentucky. They had 250 travelling ministers and preachers. Only sixty or seventy of these were “presbyters” ordained, and these the “choicest of the whole.” If, Dr. Coke suggested, the superintendents might be retained, these might consent to re-ordination. If steps toward re-union could be taken before Wesley’s death, something might be effected; later, Mr. Asbury would oppose. In response Bishop White wrote that he would be glad to talk the matter over with Dr. Coke. “It has not been my temper to despond of Christianity in this new world,” he wrote, “though feeling the most powerful discouragements in increasing infidelity.” Union amongst Christians was most desirable, but there must be “mutual sacrifices” and “no lack in Christian temper.” This opinion prevailed in the House of Bishops, but the Deputies opposed any action, and the opportunity passed.

Bishop White’s judicial mind and constant consideration of others made him accept without question Bishop Seabury’s Scottish consecration, and yet see the wisdom of Bishop Madison’s receiving his from England, in order that the English Bishops might feel assured of three Bishops with English consecration in the American Church. He welcomed Bishop Seabury at Bishop Claggett’s consecration, but concurred in the friendly device that kept him from the session of the House of Bishops in order that Bishop Prevost might take precedence. He took no active part in urging a separate House of Bishops, but when it was formed he drew up the rules for its con-

duct and adhered to them steadfastly, maintaining that the House should be "continued, were only one Bishop present." From 1804 he was Presiding Bishop. He attended every meeting of General Convention and wrote every Pastoral Letter issued by the House of Bishops to the time of his death, and attended almost every important committee meeting and every convention of his own diocese.

From 1808 the question of extending episcopacy into the Western States was brought before him. Urged by some among his missionary-minded clergy, he formed in 1816 the Episcopal Missionary Society of Philadelphia to aid Episcopalians settled in Ohio, which extended its help to Kentucky and Tennessee until the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society was organized, in 1821. In 1817 he was chairman of the committee on the General Theological Seminary, and although his own preference was for diocesan institutions, when the general school was decided upon he gave it his cordial support. From 1821 to 1830 he attended all meetings of its trustees, every annual examination and commencement, and five times delivered addresses to the students, only giving up these duties because of his eighty-two years and the tiring journey between Philadelphia and New York.

There is little mention in the records of his life of visitations in his own diocese, although by 1836 it numbered ninety-one congregations ministered to by eighty-six clergymen. In 1824, when seventy-six years of age, he went with Mr. Kemper to the western part of the State, but met with an accident and returned home with a broken wrist. Undeterred by this misadventure, in May of the following year he made a journey of 830 miles, returning in health and safety; and, in 1826, traveled 400 miles to the northeastern counties of the State.

These journeys may have had some motive in the be-

ginnings of discontent which caused the only dissensions and difficulties that marred the peaceful episcopate of Bishop White. He was an old man; he could not make long and frequent visitations; very probably remote parts of the diocese felt the need of greater and more personal care. At the same time there was a too minute oversight which had a part in this dissension, as some of the clergy objected to what their Bishop felt to be his prerogative in striking irrelevant or unsuitable matter from their parish reports before these should appear in print. So, although Bishop White came to his convention asking for an assistant, it was not so much from his own wish as from the feeling that others thought it would be best. And, as always, mindful of the judgment of his associates, he yielded to their desire.

The election was not without friction. There were partisans who opposed the choice of any but a "Low Churchman," and fortified their position with the claim that their Bishop was "Low." They had forgotten 1795 when a South Carolina clergyman had made an attack upon the House of Bishops, abusing Bishop Seabury, but exonerating Bishop White, and how their Bishop took up the matter and wrung an apology from the offender. They did not recall his comment on a criticism in a sermon which Bishop Moore had preached on Baptismal Regeneration, which their "Low Church Bishop" called "a doctrine which we have been taught to lisp in the earliest repetitions of our catechism, which pervades sundry of our services, which was confessedly held and taught during the ages of the martyrs," and "the belief in which was universal in the Church until it was perceived to be inconsistent with a religious theory, the beginning and the progress of which can be as distinctly traced as those of any error of popery." Perhaps they had never heard their Bishop's daily lectures, delivered through many

years on every day in Holy Week and on Easter Monday and Tuesday following. Had they thought on these things they might have hesitated to brand their Bishop with that party catchword. It stirred his slowly aroused righteous indignation and called forth one of the only two recorded utterances which showed his even temper to have been violently disturbed. As the term was used in England one hundred years ago, he said, he might perhaps be called so, but, with great emphasis, he added, "as the word is understood in this country, and among us now, you might as well call me a Turk or a Jew."

The nominations were concluded, the choice was made, the Assistant Bishop consecrated, and, by 1829, the old harmony had returned, to remain unbroken to the end.

It was in 1836 that the end came. On the last Sunday in June the Bishop preached with more than his ordinary vigor in St. Peter's Church. On Sunday, July 17, while his people throughout the city and diocese were praying for him, in his eighty-ninth year and the fiftieth of his episcopate, in the house where he had lived for over fifty years, he slipped out of this life so quietly that those who stood beside him did not know the moment in which he went.

His body was laid in the family vault in Christ church-yard, till in 1870 it was removed to lie under the chancel of the church itself.

His death recalled the history of the nation and Church and city for half a century past. With each his long life had been fast bound. The entire community honored and loved him, and even the "most plain and strict of Friends" spoke of him as "*our good Bishop*."

Although he thought it unwise for the Church to unite with other religious bodies in organized work, as likely to create dissension and ill-will, he was active in associations for philanthropy and education, was a trustee of his col-

lege, which, when it became the University of Pennsylvania, in 1782 conferred on him its first honorary degree, and was president of the Dispensary, Prison, Magdalene, Deaf and Dumb, Blind, Provident, Sunday School and Philadelphia Bible Societies. These interests he retained throughout his life, in his last years opposing the terms of Mr. Girard's will, which forbade the services of an ordained minister within his college. He made it a principle to attend public dinners until he reached the age of seventy, when he discontinued the practice.

Always a Republican or Federalist, though never a political partisan, he looked upon voting as a sacred trust. When, an old man, he approached the polls, the people would cease their struggle to reach the window and form a line to let him pass. Three times he said the prayers on great public occasions—at the service before the President, Senate and Representatives after Washington's death, when Major General Lee made the oration; when Horace Binney pronounced the eulogy on Chief Justice Marshall, and, still again, before the eulogy by Peter S. Duponceau on the death of Lafayette. Three times only did he consent to make public speeches—on the establishment of the American Colonization Society, at a meeting to express sympathy for the Greeks when struggling for civil and religious liberty, and in memorializing Congress on behalf of the Cherokee and other Indian nations.

These three objects were akin to those which made him a leader in the Church's missionary life. Not only did he want to establish that Church in his beloved country, but he desired also to extend her beyond these borders and to make her a channel of blessing to dark lands across the seas.

The threatenings of the ante-revolutionary days, which would have stifled an American Episcopate at its birth, he saw die into silence and forgetfulness; and he saw the

consecration of thirty-two Bishops in the American Church, upon twenty-seven of whom he laid his hands. He saw dioceses erected in Ohio and Kentucky and Tennessee, and one of his own Pennsylvania sons sent as first Missionary Bishop into the far-off West of Missouri and Indiana. He was the friend of the missionaries in Greece during the early years of their long service, and of the forerunners of the African Mission—men from his own diocese who worked under the Colonization Society on the West African Coast. As the first missionaries sailed for China he gave them a wise and good old man's parting words of counsel.

"You cannot be ignorant," he said, "that in a former age the Christian religion was extensively propagated in China. Neither can it be unknown to you that this was succeeded by an extensive persecution of all who owned the name of Christ. It is certain that the change arose from the interference of the decrees of a foreign jurisdiction with immemorial usages of the Chinese. * * * There can be no difficulty concerning this with our communion, which holds the Church in every country to be competent to self-government in all matters left to human discretion. No faithful minister of our Church * * * will bind his converts in any chain not bound on them by his Master."

As the convention of 1835 drew to its close the two Houses met together and the Presiding Bishop read the Pastoral Letter. They joined in prayer and in singing the old selection from the 133rd Psalm:

"How vast must their advantage be,
How great their pleasure prove,
Who live like brethren, and consent
In offices of love."

Then the old Bishop blessed them for the last time and went his way. He left them with new regions opening before them to possess, with the first of a long succession

of Bishop-missionaries to enter upon his work, with a new conception of the Church as herself the agency for winning the world for Christ.

If he thought of any defects in the new measures he would not try to influence his brethren after he was gone. Yet he could not but feel that his experience might help, though he made his suggestion with diffidence and the full appreciation that something unexpected might occur to control future action. Meanwhile he thanked God for the health and strength of so many years, for the peace and prosperity of the Church he had watched so long and for whose promotion he had given his best endeavors, and he prayed that that Church might be perpetuated to God's glory and to the best interests, religious and civil, of His people.

So he passed from Church and State, as he had lived, in serene composure and untroubled confidence; and the mourning of his people must have stayed while they gave thanks for the good example of a "perfect man," and an "upright," whose "end" had come in "peace."

On Finding a Substitute for Christ

REV. HENRY K. PIERCE

WE imagine that there are few men today ready to subscribe to the double affirmation that God is in His heaven and all is right with the world. Educated men, we are told, no longer believe in a personal God, and even the newspapers admit that something is very wrong with the world. Below we give a summary, taken from the *Boston Evening Transcript* of August 31, 1921, of the address made by James M. Beck, Solicitor General of the United States, before the American Bar Association's annual convention recently held at Cincin-

nati.

James M. Beck, solicitor general of the United States said "revolt against tradition and authority has sprung up not only against the political state, but in music, art, poetry and commerce until the age has become 'preeminently one of sham and counterfeit.'" He spoke on "The Spirit of Lawlessness" as follows: "The statistics of our criminal courts in recent years show an unprecedented growth in crime, but this revolt against authority is not confined to the political state. In music, its fundamental canons have been thrown aside and discord has replaced harmony. Its culmination—jazz—is a musical crime.

"In the plastic arts, the criteria of beauty have been swept aside by the futurists, cubists, vorticists and other æsthetic Bolsheviki. In poetry, beauty of rhythm and nobility of thought have been replaced by exaltation of the grotesque and brutal.

"In commerce, the revolt is one against purity of standards and the integrity of business morals. Who can question that this is preeminently the age of sham and counterfeit?"

A spirit of lawlessness always has existed, Mr. Beck said, but he cited the prevalence of burglaries, hold-ups, thefts, murder and graft to show recent growth of lawlessness. Today people regard the lessons of the past as "presumptively false," he declared, and the burden is now upon "him who seeks to invoke them."

"Two of the oldest empires in the world—China and Russia—are in a welter of anarchy," the solicitor said. "And in even the most stable governments, the underground rumblings of revolution may be heard. But of still greater significance to the welfare of civilization is the complete subversion during the World War of nearly all the international laws which have been built up. This fierce war of extermination has put us back—temporarily let us hope—a thousand years. Victors and vanquished are involved in a common ruin.

"The morale of our industrial civilization has been shattered. Work for work's sake, as the most glorious privilege of human faculties, has gone. The aversion to work is the great evil of the world today. The less a man does, the less he wants to do. The whole history of the mechanical era is a persistent struggle for more pay and shorter hours and today it has culminated in world-wide ruin. In my judgment the economic catastrophe of 1921 is far greater than the politico-military catastrophe of 1914."

Accompanying the indisposition to work, the Solicitor General continued, has been a "mad desire for pleasure such as has not been seen within the memory of living man."

"Man has danced upon the verge of a social abyss, and even the dancing has, both in form and in accompanying music, lost its former grace and reverted to the primitive forms of uncivilized conditions," Mr. Beck declared.

On another page of the same issue of the same paper there is a review by Edmund Noble of a new edition of "The Belief in God and Immortality," by James H. Leuba, professor of psychology in Bryn Mawr University. The thesis of this book might be summed up as follows. The Christian religion is no longer possible to educated and thinking men. But the vast majority require some kind of religion as a basis for self discipline and morality. Therefore, we must get together with the scientists and formulate a new and scientific religion. But let us quote from the review.

The argument is based on careful investigation into the degree which beliefs in a personal God and immortality are still held by "educated" people. Professor Leuba applied his test by means of questionnaires. One on the subject of a personal God was addressed to students in nine American colleges and one normal school; a second, dealing with the belief in immortality, was sent to the youth of "a college of high rank and moderate size whose students are divided in their affiliations among all the important Protestant denominations," a few Roman Catholics being among the number; a third, relating to both beliefs, was forwarded to 1000 scientists, sociologists, historians and psychologists, the names being taken from "American Men of Science" and chosen by a rule of chance. Not all of those addressed responded, but answers came from a sufficient number to supply the needed evidence. Summing up the inquiry, the author finds "that in every class of persons investigated the number of believers in God is less, and in most classes very much less than the number of non-believers; that the number of believers in immortality is somewhat larger than in a personal God; that among the more distinguished unbelief is very much more frequent than among the less distinguished; and finally

that not only the degree of ability, but the kind of knowledge possessed seems significantly related to the rejection of these beliefs." Professor Leuba regards the correlation shown in all the groups between eminence and disbelief "of momentous significance," and sees no way of avoiding the conclusion that "disbelief in a personal God and in personal immortality is directly proportional to ability." The student statistics are held to show that young people enter college possessed of the beliefs still accepted more or less perfunctorily in the average home of the land, and that as their mental powers mature and their horizon widens a large percentage of them abandon the cardinal Christian beliefs. "It seems probable that on leaving college from 40 to 45 per cent of the students in question deny or doubt the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. Beliefs, when they have any, are superficial and amateurish in the extreme. There is no acknowledged authority; each one believes as he can, and few seem disturbed at being unable to hold the tenets of the churches." Professor Leuba finds individualism an explanatory factor; there is more self-reliance and independence in the men as they come of age, and less of these qualities in the women, along with greater aversion on the part of the women to breaking with their social group. The deepest impression left on him by the inquiry was that "so far as religion is concerned, our students are grovelling in the darkness, that Christianity as a system of belief has utterly broken down, and that nothing definite adequate and convincing has taken its place."

The situation thus revealed is regarded by the author as demanding a revision of public opinion towards the future of the two beliefs. It shows, according to him, "the futility of the efforts of those who would meet the present religious crisis by devising more attractive social features, or even a more complete consecration of the church membership to its task." Organized Christianity faces a "widespread rejection of its two fundamental dogmas," and that rejection is "apparently destined to extend, parallel with the diffusion of knowledge and of the intellectual and other qualities that make for eminence in scholarly pursuits." A three-fold good must therefore be held in view—"the deliverance of man from the devitalising fear of imaginary disastrous consequences likely to result from the loss of the beliefs in question, his inspiration with renewed confidence in the reliability of the plans by which he feels himself urged onward, however ignorant of their nature he may

otherwise be, and his enrichment with information useful for wise guidance of his efforts at reconstruction, when reconstruction shall have appeared imperative." But for reconstruction to become a possibility there must be "sufficient widespread realization that the crumbling religious structures in which we are still dwelling have ceased to keep us spiritually warm," and along with that "an equally widespread conviction that the traditional God is not the primary source of spiritual worth and moral inspiration, but that moral values come into existence in social relationships as a natural and unavoidable consequence of the nature of man." The author holds that in the majority of instances the social sanctions are much more effective than the divine; "everyone realizes what a catastrophe would follow the removal of those social restraints, even though God and immortality should continue to exert the attenuated influence remaining to them." Why continue to think that humanity cannot go forward on its upward march unless ultimate questions are answered "in the formula given when the world was in its childhood?" And why not pave the way, in the manner suggested for "a conception of the divine which would not be opposed to the teachings of science?"

. . . He leaves to the religious bodies and their adherents the task of deciding on what new formulæ they shall unite. To humanity itself, made up largely of the unlearned, he commits the vastly more difficult, perhaps even impossible, self-discipline which would be needed to bring knowledge and faith together, to unify intellect and will, to harmonize the impulses of the heart with the requirements of the mind.

Place this book review and the preceeding news item side by side. Their appearance in the same paper is rather striking. They suggest a few comments and a few questions.

In the first place, we do not think that the facts they allege can be disputed. Mr. Beck does not exaggerate the intellectual and moral anarchy of the present day. And even a very meager acquaintance with our typical American Universities,—their students and their professors,—will more than confirm Professor Leuba's statistics. The old standards of right and wrong, of beautiful and ugly, of

true and false, are being questioned and abandoned. University students and men of science—and a vast number of others—are more often than not unbelievers.

And now let us ask ourselves (and the professor of psychology) a few questions, about the assumption that educated men no longer can accept Christianity, and the inference, that therefore a new and scientific religion is necessary.

What is an educated man? Is he one with a diploma, or is he a man with a mind disciplined to think straight,—able to put two and two together; to grasp, for example, the connection between the moral chaos of society and the abandonment of a religion speaking with authority? Do you find that the university graduates of your acquaintance think more clearly on vital issues than their neighbors? Do our modern American universities train minds to clear thinking? Or do they merely compel the assimilation of miscellaneous facts and add more or less of an air of culture? Do “men of science” judge more truly than others of right and wrong, beautiful and ugly, true and false? Do we go to psychologists for verdicts on art? Should we get purer justice if all juries were composed of chemists? Look, for instance, at the university professors of Germany, the very home of modern science. When, in 1914, vital questions of right and wrong and true and false arose, did they stand out above less “educated” men as straight thinkers?

Now about our professor’s statistics of unbelief in colleges. We think they are not full enough. He has taken his census, you will have remarked, in a single college and where Protestantism prevails. His results would be equally misleading if he had confined his investigations, for example, to the University of Louvain. We should like him to accumulate more figures, and then to classify his answers and compare the number who lapse from Protes-

tantism with the number of those who lapse from the Catholic faith. Then, defining our terms, and classing as "Christians" those who worship Christ as God and who accept the Church He founded, would he find that *Christians* are abandoning their faith in anything like the proportions he suggests? Just for the sake of truth and clear thinking let us distinguish between Christianity and mere "philanthropy-tinged-with-emotion," which so often is all that remains of Protestantism.

As to the "conflict between religion and science,"—*real* religion and *real* science,—where is it? We know of none. Old fashioned Protestantism, based on an infallible Bible interpreted by each individual to suit himself, certainly was unscientific. But old fashioned Protestantism is largely dead and what has taken its place is too vague and amorphous to conflict with anything. Most certainly there is a conflict between the Christian religion and the philosophic speculations of scientific men of the materialistic school. But we are genuinely ignorant of (and curious to learn about) any real conflict between the Catholic faith and the authentic findings of natural science. Christianity may be declining, but let us not pretend that it is abandoned because disproved by science. Misrepresentations and travesties of Christianity are abandoned because they are untenable and unsatisfying. Real religion declines today (if it does so) because the world and its standards are preferred to Christ and His laws. There is the conflict and there it always has been. The new, scientific, man-made religion which is to replace Christianity should, if it is to be popular, take account of all the troubles the Church has experienced and make some friendly compromise with the seven deadly sins.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Spirit of Peace. By the Rt. Rev. A. F. Winnington Ingram. 1921. crown 8vo. Morehouse Pub. Co. \$1.40.

The Vision of Purity, a sermon preached in connection with the Lambeth Conference in Westminster Abbey, by the Bishop of London. paper. Wells Gardner. 10c.

It is refreshing to take up another volume of the safe, simple, sane and solid sermons of the Bishop of London. As in the 16th and 17th centuries, so in the present time, the search for peace seems to have produced a flood of mystical writings concerned with *faith* and oblivious of *The Faith*, aspiring to a vague Love of God without caring for that knowledge of Him revealed by His Church and which alone can lead to Him.

It is true that the world does not want an abstract theology, and that people are apt to turn from sermons overweighted with dogma; but there is a grave danger, noticeable in some recently published sermons and mystical writings, lest pantheistic philosophy, Calvinistic theology, and Quietism be allowed to creep in. When this subtle form of Protestantism shrouds itself in mystical language and cloaks itself in external Catholic practice it becomes a menace.

But the sermons of the Bishop of London ring true. While they are simple and practical one knows that behind them there is the security of sound doctrine. In that on "The Cross" the Bishop points out that the Cross of Christ must be carried *daily*. Here is no claim to have made the great self-sacrifice once for all, or that even the saint can get beyond the possibility of sinning; but a warrior's faith that finds its peace in a *daily* warfare against evil. In that entitled "The Everlasting Arms" the Peace of God is given to those who possess *humility of spirit, purity of heart and activity of mind*. It is a mistake to think that the ideal Christian is full of a beautiful spiritual comfort, which is only a luxury to be kept to himself. Nothing is truer today than the saying "He that saveth his life shall lose it; and he that loesth his life shall save it." The Peace of God is founded not upon assurance but on the fear of God.

There are reminiscences in this volume of some former sermons by the same writer; there are some that stand out, such as "The Calls of God" and those already mentioned, but both here and in "The Vision of Purity" the voice is the voice of one of the true Sons of God, and the "Spirit of Peace" is for those who will stand with him and fight for the Church that is, in the Bishop's closing words, "Wide Awake."

M. R. B.